JESUIT COLLEGE LIBRARY
ST. BONIFACIUS, MINN.

2 Vol

INTERNATIONAL CHRISTIAN
GRADUATE UNIVERSITY

THOUGHT FOUNDATION: HISTORICAL SERIES, NO. 1

LIFE AND TIMES OF JOHN ENGLAND
(1786-1842)

THE LIFE AND TIMES
OF
JOHN ENGLAND

FIRST BISHOP OF CHARLESTON

(1786-1842)

BY
PETER GUILDAY
PROFESSOR OF CHURCH HISTORY
CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA

IN TWO VOLUMES
VOL. II.

THE AMERICA PRESS
NEW YORK
1927

JESUIT COLLEGE LIBRARY
ST. BONIFACIUS, MINN.

920
En3
D94

INTERNATIONAL CHRISTIAN
GRADUATE UNIVERSITY

BX
4705
E58
G955
1927
v. 2

Contents of the Second Volume

CHAPTER

XIX. Public Discourses. 1824-1842 . . . 1

XX. The Address Before Congress. 1826 . . 48

XXI. Antecedents to the First Provincial Council. 1821-1828 68

XXII. First Provincial Council of Baltimore. 1829 111

XXIII. Catholic Education and Social Welfare . 133

XXIV. Foreign Catholic Missionary Societies. 1822-1842 173

XXV. National Catholic Progress. 1829-1833 . 214

XXVI. The Second Provincial Council of Baltimore. 1833 243

XXVII. The Apostolic Delegation to Haiti. 1833-1837 270

XXVIII. Coadjutor-Bishop William Clancy. 1834-1837 314

XXIX. The Letter to the Society of Lyons. 1836 352

XXX. The Third Provincial Council of Baltimore. 1837 377

XXXI. Writings of Bishop England I. 1822-1828 . 405

XXXII. Writings of Bishop England II. 1828-1840 . 443

XXXIII. General Conventions of the Diocese. 1839-1841 480

XXXIV. Fourth Provincial Council of Baltimore. 1840 502

XXXV. Last Illness and Death. 1842 . . . 530

Appendix. Essay on the Sources 555

Index 564

17210

CHAPTER XIX

Public Discourses

(1824-1841)

In announcing to the Catholic clergy of the United States in March, 1847, his design to publish Dr. England's *Works*, Bishop Ignatius Reynolds tells us that his chief motive was to preserve for future generations the labors of a great writer and orator who possessed in an eminent degree the talent of communicating his thoughts in a style remarkable for its strength and beauty and clearness, of always marshalling his arguments to the greatest advantage, and of accommodating himself to the circumstances and spirit of his age.[1]

No project of this kind ever designed in the history of the American Church had more brilliant editors: James A. Corcoran; Patrick Neeson Lynch; and Augustine F. Hewit, one of that remarkable group of priests who were to found the Paulists in 1858.

There must be a motive to induce one to read Dr. England's published writings, we read in the Introduction to his *Works*. That motive,

> is the life and character of this wonderful man. It was not only the perfect periods of his rhetoric and the crystal clearness of his reasoning that crowded St. Finnbar's Cathedral with the elite of Charleston. It was belief in the man as well, in his sincerity, his singleness of motive, his spirit of sacrifice, his absolute consecration of himself to the service of God and the salvation of souls. All this was in his daily life as they saw it and this passed into his works and gave them a living force. Such a man could persuade as well as convince. His learning was profound and varied. . . . He was a master of logic. But his personality dominated all these and invariably impressed itself upon his students, priests and people.[2]

In one sense, Bishop England's sermons were all public discourses. The announcement that he was to preach always brought

---

[1]Preface to volume I, p. v. Baltimore, 1847-49.

[2]Duffy, in *Biographical Introduction* to Messmer edition of England's *Works*, vol. I, pp. xvi-xvii. Cleveland, 1908.

large audiences to his own cathedral; to the churches, Catholic and non-Catholic, in the Carolinas and Georgia, whose pulpits he occupied; to the court houses and assembly halls; and to open-air meetings held mostly under Protestant auspices. His twenty discourses to the Conventions of the three States and to the Society of St. John the Baptist, which he had organized on the model of the Society for the Propagation of the Faith of Lyons, were all public when given, or became public immediately in the columns of the *Miscellany*.

The discourses, however, which are chosen here for a brief analysis of his oratory are most properly called public discourses in the sense that they were prepared for general assemblies.

The first of these is his *Epochs of Irish History*, delivered in 1824. By a singular coincidence, writes Thomas D'Arcy McGee, in his *Catholic History of North America*,

> Ireland and America began clamoring at the gates of British power for redress at one and the same time. Both began with the Navigation Act, with taxation, and with free trade; both advanced by degrees to declarations of political sovereignty, America in 1776, Ireland in 1780; both obtained the recognition of their demands the same year, from the same ministry and the same monarch. This identity of causes produced identity of feeling; identity of feeling led to open acts of sympathy and correspondence; the double diversion thus effected—was mutually beneficial. America's resistance gave Ireland an opportunity to propose her ultimatum; and Ireland's ultimatum helped to hasten the recognition of America's independence.[3]

This identity of Irish and American history goes back much farther than the days of the War of Independence. M. J. O'Brien's contribution to the subject, *A Hidden Phase of American History*, has brought out a striking amount of testimony for Irish participation in the colonial culture of America; and the historian of the United States can no longer pass over in silence Ireland's part in the making of America or allow his pen to copy the misstatements of his predecessors. Catholic Irish from the South and West of Ireland and non-Catholic Irish from the North of the Emerald Isle are no longer being ignored in the study of the colonial, revolutionary

[3]Pp. 246-247.

or national periods of our history; and within recent years a flood of new light has been thrown upon the contribution Ireland made from the time of the English settlement at Jamestown to the present.

> Irishmen were signers of the Declaration of Independence; Irishmen were members of the first American Congress which began in 1774 and continued down to the year of the framing of the Constitution; Irishmen were among the Framers of the Constitution; Irishmen commanded brigades and regiments in the struggle for independence, and an Irishman [Commodore John Barry] stands in the unique position of Father of the American Navy. Irishmen were Governors of American provinces and States prior to the opening of the nineteenth century; an Irishman [Dongan] was Governor of the Province of New York, and another [Sir William Johnson] was governor of the Indians from the Hudson to the Mississippi River; Irishmen were Governors of the Carolinas; an Irishman governed the Province of Maryland; an Irishman was the first Governor of Delaware; and another Irishman was one of the earliest Governors of the State of Pennsylvania; the son of an Irishman was the first Governor of the State of New York, and the son of an Irishman was the first Mayor of the City of New York after the Revolution.[4]

Irish schoolmasters were also to be found in every part of the colonies. O'Brien gives a typical example of their position in American history by citing the case of John Sullivan, who came to New England in 1723, and applied to the Rev. Mr. Moody, of Scotland Parish, Maine, for the post of teacher in the community, with a letter written in seven languages. John Sullivan was

> the father of a Governor of New Hampshire and of a Governor of Massachusetts, of the first Judge appointed in New Hampshire, of an Attorney-General of New Hampshire, of a Major-General in the Revolutionary army, and of four sons who were officers in that army; he was the grandfather of a Governor of Maine and of a United States Senator from New Hampshire and of an Attorney-General of that State; the great-grandfather of an Attorney-General of New Hampshire and of a Judge of its courts, and the great-great-grandfather of a distinguished officer in the Civil War.[5]

The earliest known record of an Irish emigration to the Caro-

---

[4]O'Brien, *op. cit.*, pp. 358-359. Many documents on the nature and extent of immigration from Ireland will be found in Abbott, *Historical Aspects of the Immigration Problem.* Chicago, 1926.

[5]*Ibid.*, p. 248.

linas is given in the *Shaftesbury Papers,* which record that a large colony of Irish men and women left for South Carolina in 1669. Towards the end of the seventeenth century an Irish settlement was begun in Berkeley County, South Carolina, some of the settlers coming from the Northern colonies and others from the Irish groups then in the Barbadoes. Ramsay in his *History of South Carolina* says that "of all countries none have furnished the province with so many inhabitants as Ireland. Scarce a ship sailed from any of its ports for Charleston that was not crowded with men, women and children."

To North Carolina also many Irishmen came during the first half of the eighteenth century. These were mostly from the North of Ireland or Irish from Pennsylvania. The *Colonial Records* of the State tell us that the early Irish immigrants came to the Carolinas by two routes: one by the Delaware River from Pennsylvania; the other by the port of Charleston:

> Those landing at the Southern port immediately sought the fertile forests of the upper country, approaching North Carolina and Georgia on the other, and not being particular about boundaries, extended southward at pleasure; while on the north they were checked by a counter tide of immigration. Those who landed on the Delaware, after the desirable lands east of the Alleghenies in Pennsylvania were occupied, turned their course southward and were speedily on the Catawba. Passing on, they met the southern tide, and the stream turned westward to the wilderness long known as "beyond the mountains" (now Tennessee). These two streams from the same original fountain, Ireland, meeting and intermingling in this new soil, preserve their characteristic differences, the one possessing some of the air and manner of Pennsylvania, the other of Charleston.

The *Colonial Records of Georgia* indicate an equally important infusion of Irish blood into that colony, and Irishmen are among the earliest builders of towns in the State. Many of these emigrants came from the North, from the Carolinas, Pennsylvania and Maryland, and there is a record for the year 1768, that "the most numerous single colony which, up to that time, had come to Georgia from any European country," came from Ireland.

Not all these emigrants into the Carolinas and Georgia were "convicts" or "redemptioners." Many were schoolmasters in an

epoch when that profession demanded a very high type of scholar. Many others were self-exiled on account of political principles. All classes of Irishman in the colonies, in spite of various differences which were ineradicable, were as one in the hereditary sense of wrong inflicted on their land by the British Government from time immemorial. It is now generally admitted that from the reign of James I (1603-1625) until the War of Independence, a period of a century and a half, the American colonies witnessed a steady and ever-increasing influx of Irish immigrants. Political principles bound them together, wherever they settled. "An Irishman, the instant he set foot on American soil," wrote an English visitor in 1782, "became *ipso facto* an American." But the fact that needs hardly any emphasis in the long history of the Irish in America is their enthusiastic love for their native land. Knowledge of political crises in Ireland was spread among Irishmen and their descendants here, and a close friendship existed between the colonists and those who were struggling at home for freedom. A sense of social homogeneity has never been absent from the Irish people in whatever quarter of the world they settled; and there grew up in consequence in eighteenth-century colonial America various societies which had for their object the social and political well-being of their race.

One of the earliest of these was the Boston Charitable Irish Society, founded in 1737. Prior to the Revolution, but post-dating the Sons of Liberty by a few years, was the Society of the Friendly Sons of Saint Patrick, founded in Philadelphia in 1771 and in New York in 1784. A similar organization, the Hibernian Society for the Relief of Emigrants from Ireland, was established in Philadelphia in 1770, and in 1779 the Hibernian Society was incorporated in Charleston, one of the founders being Father Simon Felix Gallagher. This organization became popular in the Carolinas and Georgia, and Dr. England could hardly fail to take a keen interest in its charitable and social activities. All these societies were primarily benevolent organizations. The bond of union was the Irish nationality of its members either by birth or parentage, and the maintenance of the national spirit was one of the primary objects of the society. But this devotion to the history and tradi-

tions of their native land was constantly and inseparably bound up with an unwavering loyalty to the land of their adoption.[6]

The soul of the movement for Irish freedom at the end of the eighteenth century was the Society of United Irishmen, founded in 1791, by a group of Irishmen of Belfast. The emancipation of Catholic Ireland and Parliamentary Reform were the chief objects of the society, and branches were soon begun in the United States, traces of their activity being visible as early as 1794. Newspapers were founded to carry the message of the leaders to their American subscribers; the chief of these was the New York *Aurora*, then a mouthpiece of the Jeffersonian party. The English Government could not overlook the danger of the influence wielded in America by these groups, and the British Minister, Sir Robert Liston, is said in consequence to have used his power with friends of President Adams to have the Alien and Sedition Laws passed in 1798. While ostensibly enacted to give the President and Congress a free hand in our foreign relations with France, the opposition press, mainly controlled by Irishmen, criticized the Alien law with just severity.[7] Rufus King, the American Minister to England, unfortunately showed scant courtesy to the leaders of the United Irishmen, when they were given freedom after the failure of the Rebellion, on condition that they quit British territory. King opposed the emigration of Thomas Addis Emmet, MacNeven, and other leaders, and for four more years they remained in prison. About 1804, they were released and came to New York, and it was inevitable that they should take a prominent part in the political affairs of their adopted country. Their influence brought about even a closer union between the Irish at home and in the United States.[8]

---

[6]Cf. *The Irish in America*, by Peter Condon, in the *Catholic Encyclopedia*, vol. VIII, p. 143.

[7]Cf. *Men of Irish Blood who have attained Distinction in American Journalism*, by M. E. Hennessy, in the *Journal of the American Irish Historical Society*, vol. III, p. 63. Matthew Lyon was the first Irishman to suffer under the Sedition Law. Strangely enough, Adams met his defeat for re-election by Lyon's deciding vote.

[8]W. J. MacNeven, *Pieces of Irish History, illustrative of the Conditions of the Catholics of Ireland, of the Origin and Progress of the Political System of the United Irishmen, and of their Transactions with the Anglo-Irish Government.* New York, 1807; Madden, *History of Irish Periodical Literature*, 2 vols. London, 1867; Foik, *Pioneer Efforts of Catholic Journalism in the United States* (365 pp.) — MS in the Library of the Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C. A digest of this volume will be found in the *Catholic Historical Review*, vol. I, pp. 258-270.

American-Irish newspapers became a weapon in the final struggle with Great Britain for the emancipation of Catholic Ireland. The *Shamrock* or *Hibernian Chronicle* (1810), the *Globe and Emerald* (1824), the *Truth Teller* (1825), the *Irish Shield and Monthly Milesian* (1828), and the *Irish Advocate* (1831), are some among the various press enterprises started at this time to keep Irish-Americans properly informed of the progress towards Emancipation and also to lay before them the status of political parties in the United States on questions touching Irish Freedom. The *Irishman and Charleston Weekly Register*, begun in Charleston in 1829, is a link between the partly political newspress of this first period and the second, when the object of these papers became largely the defense of Irish history and tradition and of the Catholic Faith.

The appearance of Bishop England's *Miscellany* in June, 1822, gave joy to all his Irish compatriots in the United States. Here was a weekly newspaper, edited by the foremost spirit in the American Church, by one who had already won laurels in the Veto Controversy, and it was to be expected that Dr. England would admirably carry on the fight for enlightenment in the South. His Visitation of 1821-23 had spread his fame in almost every city of the three States under his jurisdiction. By actual count, from January 1, 1821, until the last date in the *Diurnal*, December 5, 1823, he had given two hundred and seven public discourses in all the important centers of the three States, in court houses, in Presbyterian, Methodist, Baptist, and Episcopalian churches, and in the houses of non-Catholics. It is doubtful whether any American bishop had such remarkable experiences. He was met everywhere with a charming courtesy on the part of the town officials and non-Catholic ministers, who vied with one another to secure him for their churches. Two sermons a day, sometimes three, not to speak of private exhortations to the little groups of Catholics he discovered, were the ordinary demand on his energies. One has but to search the precious pages of the *Diurnal* to realize that there was something so attractive in his discourses, and so sincere in the man himself, that differences of belief were forgotten in the desire to hear Christian truths explained by a young bishop who was all that Southern culture and intelligence might desire. His fame as a

public speaker increased from this time forward, and before many years had passed

> from one end of the Union to the other, his name became a household word with Catholics of every nationality, who recognized in him a champion fully equipped, and equal to the good fight. The feeling of his own countrymen towards him cannot be described, so intense was their pride in his great qualities, his power of pen and tongue, his resistless force as a controversialist, his capacity for public affairs, the nobleness and grandeur of his nature, which all men respected, and which made for him the fastest friends among those who were not of his Church. There were other great and good bishops, who by their saintly character and holy lives commanded a respectful toleration for their faith; but Bishop England extorted respect for his religion by the matchless power with which he unfolded its principles to those who crowded round him wherever he went, and refuted the calumnies and misrepresentations that had been the stock-in-trade of the enemies of Catholicity for centuries. Like all Irishmen, of that day as of the present, Bishop England at once became an American citizen, thoroughly identified with his adopted country, proud of her greatness, jealous of her honour, loving her beyond all others, save that old land whose recollection lay warm in his heart.[9]

March Seventeenth was a holiday second only to the Fourth of July in all the larger cities where a fitting celebration might be held. Accordingly, Dr. England was invited by the Hibernian Society of Savannah to deliver the annual address on St. Patrick's Day, 1824, in that city. This was the occasion of his first public discourse: *Epochs of Irish History*. The *Miscellany* for March 24, 1824, thus describes the ceremony:

> The Hibernian Society of Savannah, having requested the Bishop to deliver a discourse suitable to the occasion, that body, accompanied by the mayor and several other distinguished citizens and public officers, marched in procession from the city hotel, at twelve o'clock, preceded by an excellent band of music, and having the green flag of Erin, with its golden harp surrounded by shamrocks, the entire trimmed with deep gold fringe waving on high. Seats had been kept for the gentlemen who formed the procession, to which they advanced to the national air of *St. Patrick's Day*. The pews of

[9]Maguire, *The Irish in America*, p. 391.

the centre aisle were exclusively for ladies; those of the northern and southern aisles were thronged with ladies and gentlemen, whilst some of the first citizens of Georgia, together with some of the stoutest boys who left *the sod* with their bunches of the lovely green, gave a true exhibition of equality, in the close packing of the aisles themselves. On the platform of the altar three chairs were occupied by the Rev. Robert Browne, the Pastor of the Church, the Rev. Abiel Carter, the Protestant Episcopal Clergyman, and the Rev. Mr. Howe, the Presbyterian Clergyman. The President of the Trustees of the Church, Mr. Gaudry, led the President of the Society, Colonel Hunter, to his seat. Liberty Square, on which the church fronts, contained hundreds who could not find room to enter, and whom the rain, which commenced after the entrance of the procession, compelled reluctantly to disperse. The Right Rev. Dr. England appeared in the pulpit, with a cross formed with shamrocks on his stole, and after telling the history of Ireland's greatness, of her wrongs and of her woes, in doing which he was often much affected, but not without the full sympathy of those who surrounded him, he concluded with the two last verses of Moore's beautiful poem, *O blame not the Bard*, after having enforced the moral, that misery and ruin must be the portion of every country which creates and preserves sectional and sectarian hostility and beseeching the Americans, native and adopted, to avoid the rock upon which his country had been ruined.

We learn from a letter, written at Augusta, August 8, 1824, that Dr. England's address was given without notes. "I was unable," he writes, "to make any preparation; the shortness of the notice and the importance of the duties in the discharge of which I was occupied, left me no time to make any arranged discourse. I therefore took the order of our history, trusting to my feelings for whatever reflections it might be proper to make." When the Hibernian Society asked for a copy of the address in order to publish it, he set to work in the midst of his Visitation of Georgia and wrote out the discourse as best he remembered it. The result is a remarkable composition, both by the arrangement of the contents as well as by its eloquence.

The argument is clearly put: the history of Ireland is a mirror for America. He traces the civilization of the Irish back to the remotest times. All the sources he used are not visible in the address, but it is evident that Mathew Carey's *Vindiciae Hibernicae*

or Ireland Vindicated, which that well-known publicist printed in Philadelphia in 1819, is the main fountain of many of his citations. A new and enlarged edition of this most successful of all early American works on Ireland came out in 1823, and with this source-book at hand, Dr. England needed little else to direct his pen. Francis Plowden is quoted in his *Epochs* as are Sir John Davies and the Bishop of Derry's *Irish Historical Library*.[10]

The *Epochs of Irish History* is one of the clearest expositions on that subject in English.[11] Dr. England traces Ireland's story in pre-Christian times, first of all by means of the *monumenta* scattered through the country. The systematic destruction of documents from the reign of Henry II to that of James I left little written testimony for the historian; but, as Dr. England said, the traditions lived on among the people:

> . . . . though the parchment should be shrivelled to ashes in the flames; though the sceptre may be stricken from the monarch's hand; and the pointed crown be torn from his dishevelled head; though the assembly may be driven from the hall of deliberation, and the blazonings of heraldic precedence be mingled in confusion and trampled in the dust; though it may be criminal to preserve the name of your progenitors, and the great portion of the people should be compelled to take up surnames from trades and occupations, and in a language which was yet scarcely blending into form, and next to unintelligible: still the memory of facts will outlive the destruction of their testimony, and the reasonable traditions of a nation will supply the place of writings.

He then treats the problem of the origin of the Irish, with their social and religious customs up to the coming of St. Patrick, their Apostle. The historical sources for these years, he says, which have been preserved, coincide with the tradition and the songs of the people. Acting on the principle that "there is no Saint of whom we have more lives and of whom we know less than St. Patrick," Dr. England touches but slightly upon the details of his life. He sums up the introduction of the Christian Faith into Ireland in a splendid phrase: "Whatever may have been the cause, Ireland did

---

[10]The copy of this rare volume (Dublin, 1724) in the Library of the Catholic University of America has bound with it an original print of that scarce little book, *History of the Irish Writers*, by William Harris (Dublin, 1736).

[11]*Works* (Messmer), vol. VII, p. 398.

not slay her Apostles." The fruits of Patrick's apostolic labors are described in a passage that deserves to be remembered:

> . . . . upon the arrival of Patrick, a new impulse was given to the missionary force, and the true religion began widely to diffuse itself. Much opposition, of course, was made by many to the labours of the apostle; but he, well knowing that his doctrines were such as could bear to have their foundations closely examined, desired at once to lay them before the assembled wisdom and judgment, and learning of the nation. He went to the Congress at Tara, and there openly preached a crucified God. The Druids and principal abettors of the Irish mythology disputed with him; but he was chiefly thwarted by the machinations, and intrigues, and open resistance of Niall, the son of the monarch, whose influence was very extensive. So that the apostle did not, at this time, reap all the fruit upon which he had calculated. Yet were many persons brought to a deep sense of the folly of idolatry, and the necessity of serving God, who is a spirit, in spirit and in truth.
>
> The only positive infliction of which we have an account, is of one subsequently to this—an imprisonment of the saint and his companion in irons during about fourteen days. Being released from durance, he went southwards, and converted the King of Munster and his family; then going up towards the northwest, he brought over the King of Connaught, and his sons to the profession of the faith, and carried on the mission in Ulster with extraordinary success. In a short time churches rose upon the ruins of idols. Monasteries of men and women were everywhere founded, and the religion of Christ in a few years predominated through the island. *We have no record of so sudden, so perfect, so general a conversion of any other nation.* The apostle of Ireland saw his flock now too large for his superintendence, and new bishoprics were created. His name is now held in esteem, and in that same assembly at Tara, where on a former occasion he was disappointed, he is now covered with honours: he is admitted to his seat, he is ranked amongst their most learned men, and made one of the judges to preserve the purity of their historical records. The place formerly held by the teachers of idolatry is now given to the apostles of the Lamb. Ireland now adds the gem of Roman literature to the treasures which she had long possessed, and her clergy and laity are emulous of each other in making progress in the new field of learning to which they had been introduced. Her ancient music resounds in the temple of the living God, and her virgins lift the melody of their voices to celebrate in grateful notes, the triumph of redemp-

> tion. O, land of my fathers! how beauteous were your hills, how lovely were your valleys, how pure were your streams in that day before the eye of heaven! The hand of the spoiler did not desolate your fields; the foot of the stranger was not upon the necks of your children; the sword of the persecutor did not stain your temples with blood; the torch of the incendiary did not consume the retreats of devotion; the ruthless bigot had not as yet armed your sons for their mutual destruction; but the conviction of the understanding formed the basis of piety, and perfect charity exhibited the form of undefiled religion. The children of Ireland were in that day known to be disciples of our Lord Jesus, because they loved one another. The days of Patrick were prolonged until from his metropolitan eminence of Armagh, he beheld the land flourish in beauty, lovely in peace, and decorated with virtue.

The place of the Irish in the dark days which followed the collapse of the Roman Empire is then described and with sheer beauty of diction the discourse moves with splendid stateliness down through the Middle Ages to the days of the Normans: "The head of the venomous destroyer" as he calls that race, "was frequently lopped off; but the fens of Lerna never nurtured a more multiplying antagonist than the defeated and yet conquering barbarian of the North. He sat down in France, he occupied England, he assailed Ireland. Often repulsed, he yet returned, and at length had considerable possessions and extensive sway in our country."

Then follow the conquest of Ireland under Henry Plantagenet and the long night that set in for her people. "Let it be to you," Dr. England warns his American auditors, "a lesson of caution. May the sad fate of my country create in you vigilance to detect and firmness to restrain those ambitious and immoral individuals who would divide a people, that they may build up their own fortunes with the fragments of national union."

The period of the Protestant Rebellion he would prefer not to treat:

> I do not wish, my friends, to excite in you, nor to revive in myself, those feelings of pain and indignation which the subsequent history of Ireland is but too well calculated to create. The Danes commenced the destruction of its records and the system of its disorganization. Other more successful and more persevering enemies were now their successors. It was asked by

a poet subsequently to this epoch, *Cur lyra percussa, funestas edidit sonores*? And it was well answered, that the sound of the national music should be that of mournful melody, because in the day of her disaster, her liberties had been cloven down, her children were devoted to slavery, she was seated in the dust, her glory was tarnished, her face bedewed with tears, the testimonies of her greatness were torn away and destroyed, she was sprinkled with obloquy, even sucklings were brought to laugh at her woe, and to mock at her affliction. A proud neighbor who had plundered her of her jewels flung the garb of folly on her shoulders and pointed her out to the derision of the world. How could her harp be tuned to mirth and revelry? Well might her children answer as did God's chosen people of old: "Upon the rivers of Babylon, there we sat and we wept, when we remembered Sion. Upon the willows in the midst thereof we hung up our harps; because there they who led us captive asked for the words of our songs, and they who led us away said, 'Sing to us a hymn of the canticles of Sion.' How shall we sing the song of the Lord in a strange land? If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, may my right hand be forgotten: may my tongue cleave to my jaws if I do not remember thee. If I do not place Jerusalem as the beginning of my joy." Yes, my friends, human nature is the same in every age and throughout the world. The Israelite in Babylon and the Irishman in his own land of streams, equally felt the hand of the oppressor. I shall not continue.

No man in Ireland, Dr. England says, dared write the true history of these centuries of Irish history. Dark and more dark are the tints in which those times must be painted:

> Let us not too closely view the picture. O! well do I recollect that the relations of my aged countrymen, when seated on their knees I listened to the tales of their sufferings, and the reality of the evils which they endured from the men who claimed pre-eminence in civilized society, exceeded the descriptions of romance; and the highly coloured tints of the poet, who writes to make his readers weep, are light and vapid when contrasted with the glowing streaks of oppression which may be traced on the humbled children of Ireland. How often have I wept at the escapes and the endurance of my grandsires! Their lot was humble, because they professed the religion of their progenitors. Never, whilst memory holds her seat shall I forget the story of the woes of my father, which with tears he related me to prove my comparative happiness; for he narrowly escaped the fate of a felon because, without changing his

religion, he dared to explore the vestibule of science; and yet the people of Ireland are accused of being ignorant! O, my friends, what is that policy which barbarizes and then reproaches you with barbarism? It is true, that in comparison with my progenitors of a few centuries my trials have been nothing: . . . But, thank God, I at length breathe the air of a freeman, and no one reproaches me with the causes of my glory—that I am sprung from a country which was civilized before others were discovered; that my religion is coeval with Christianity, coextensive with civilization.

If the minds of his hearers could but rest without torture for a moment he would bring home to them the lesson of the dread days gone by:

O, ter quaterque beati, may we pronounce the sons of America—not for having fallen under their walls without having witnessed the ruin of their country—but for enjoying all the blessing of freedom without having tasted the bitterness of slavery, and without having experienced the afflictions of persecution.

O, nimium felices si sua bona norint. They do not value the mighty benefits the want of which they have never experienced. Let them see an island rich in soil and blooming in culture, yet a prey to every species of tyranny and despotism, filled with crime and a charnel-house from the executioner; these are the lamentable consequences of sectional and sectarian broils; the force of her people is broken, their energies are paralyzed, and they are the prey of a despicable oligarchy, because they permit themselves to be foolishly excited and wickedly played off against each other. O, tell it to your children and to your children's children, and let them transmit the moral to your latest descendants. *My country has been ruined because her people were parcelled into parties and the parties were like the offspring of the dragon's teeth armed for mutual destruction.* The balmy air of charity surrounds and invigorates us here. O, may it never be tainted!

Bishop England then does ample justice to the Presbyterians of the North of Ireland, to the United Irishmen, and to many distinguished members of the Established Church, for the strides they had made since 1791, in securing liberty and toleration for their country. "Never in a body", he said, "was there found more true patriotism than in the body of the Presbyterian Clergy of Ireland of that day." But again sectarian hatreds were let loose upon the

land by their oppressors and the hopes of liberty were destroyed. The moral was self-evident:

> Here we have religious differences; but here we freely discuss religious topics in language respectful to the feelings of each other; here each follows the conviction of his own mind, and is accountable only at the tribunal of that God who will judge us all, and to whom only we stand or fall, and he alone can clearly decide who is obstinately or carelessly wrong, and who is innocently and invincibly ignorant of his truth, and his justice requires the condemnation of the former, but his mercy protects the latter. Whilst we sedulously inquire, and freely discuss, we must leave to him his exclusive prerogative, that of deciding upon the merit and the fate of individuals. He who, positively certain of his adhesion to truth, would call down fire from heaven upon unbelieving cities or obstinate individuals, knows not by what spirit he is led. It is the pride of human passion, and not the ardour of religious zeal. Persecution makes hypocrites; to hate a person even for infidelity is a crime against charity, and to grasp the sword to punish for unbelief is to usurp the seat of the judging Son of Man. I do not know of any other to whom that commission has been given. No person who wants charity will enter heaven, and to usurp the exclusive office of the Redeemer is not the best ground on which a claim of salvation can rest. I possess evidence of truth, but I cannot without being able to inspect the mind of him who differs from me, possess evidence that he knows himself to be in opposition to truth. Free discussion, and difference of doctrine, are perfectly compatible with affection and charity. But hatred, and religious discord, and persecution, have ruined many souls. Let us learn wisdom from the misfortunes of my country.

Dr. England then recalls the days of the Veto Controversy in which he was a participant, and describes the efforts of the Catholic clergy to offset any union of Church and State in Ireland. "May God long preserve the liberties of America", he says, "from any union of any Church with any State!"

Upon this note he ends his discourse, and to this note the entire purpose of the *Essay* was to lead. It is to these years of the first quarter of the nineteenth century that we must trace the movement, known under various names since that time, which sought to deprive Catholic Americans of their freedom under the laws of the land.

In contrast to the scenes of violence against the Church which

Dr. England was to witness before his death, is the description of the courtesies paid to him after his address at Savannah was delivered. The Hibernian Society proceeded to the City Hotel, and a Captain Poole spoke in the name of the members:

> The address which you have this day delivered has shed a burst of light on the historic page of that ill-fated country, which notwithstanding persecution at home and prejudice abroad, still maintains her claim to *genius*, *literature*, and *hospitality*. The Society in conferring honorary membership on you, has acted in obedience to grateful feeling; and we, in discharging the duty confided to us, feel highly gratified, assured, as we are, that we have been made the means of conveying to you an honour to which your merit entitles you. We hope, sir, that you will receive it as it is intended, and indulge in the further expectation that your religious instruction, moral rectitude and national feelings, will be productive of benefit to our common country.[12]

Three years passed before Dr. England again found the leisure to accept one of the many invitations to address the learned and patriotic societies within his diocese. On January 10, 1827, he delivered a lecture on *The Religion and Customs of the Tribes of the American Indians* before the Literary and Philosophical Society of Charleston, at the City Hall. It is difficult to know how he came to choose the subject. As printed, the essay consists of two parts, one of which was delivered that evening, the other appearing later in the *Southern Review*. The treatment is not a happy one; the argument is involved; and the ideas at times are confused. The thesis is an argument to disprove a position taken by the historian Hume:—that polytheism was man's first religion and the savage his first social state. Citations in favor of the thesis are given from the printed discourses of Sir William Jones, President of the Asiatic Society. The importance of the lecture comes not so much from the first part as from the second, in which Dr. England gives forty pages of translated quotations from the *Lettres Edifiantes et Curieuses*, printed in Paris in 1781, a set of which was in his library. This was the first time in the history of American literature that attention was called to the wealth of scientific material in the

[12] *Cath. Misc.*, vol. V, p. 57.

Letters and *Relations* of the Jesuits and other missionaries among the Indian tribes.[13]

Dr. England's next notable discourse was on *The Origin and History of the Duel.* Duelling came into the South with the earliest settlers and remained for over two centuries an accepted part of the social code. Gamble writes in his *Savannah Duels and Duellists (1737-1877)*: "A blow, an intimation of dishonesty, a reflection on veracity, a sharp difference of opinion on a political issue, an accusation of cheating at cards, an insinuation of unchastity on the part of a woman, these and other offenses of less magnitude constituted the provocation that justified challenges."[14] One has but to peruse the pages of this and similar volumes to appreciate the extent of the social plague caused by duelling in the South up to the last generation. The practice grew beyond all control in the first quarter of the nineteenth century. So frequent had duels become that public-spirited men in the leading cities of the South began in 1825-1826 the promotion of Anti-Duelling Associations. In Charleston, such a body had been founded in 1825, to put an end to the practice, and Dr. England was one of its leading spirits. The constitution of the Savannah Society strictly condemned duelling as a violation of law, both human and divine, as hostile to the peace and good order of society, and as destructive to the happiness of domestic life. The method adopted by its members was a

> seasonable and friendly interposition, with or without the aid of the civil magistracy, as was seen to them most expedient, to prevent the occurrence of any contemplated or appointed duel, of which they may have information or well-founded apprehension, and to procure from time to time the publication of such essays or papers against duelling as they may deem calculated to operate for the correction of the error of the prevalent opinion on the subject.

Such a movement was not permitted to grow without a strong opposition; but public opinion was gradually awakened, and for some years the practice of duelling decreased. The principal work done by the Anti-Duelling Association was to inform the public mind on the illegality of the practice. It is to John England's

[13] *Works* (Messmer), vol. V, pp. 104-159; cf. L. Farrand, *Basis of American History*, pp. 248-261. New York, 1904.

[14] P. 183. Savannah, 1925.

credit that he accomplished this in his address *On the Origin and History of the Duel,* delivered before the Anti-Duelling Association in the Cathedral at Charleston in November, 1827.[15] It has been said of this address that "it is one of the most masterly and over-powering productions ever penned in any language!"

That there was much confusion of thought on the origin of the duel, Dr. England took for granted:

> It is a matter of notoriety that during several ages a practice has prevailed, more or less generally, amongst civilized nations, of terminating some differences of individuals by single combat, in a manner previously arranged; and this fight has at times been considered a very becoming and honourable mode of closing those altercations. Some persons have frequently endeavoured to find in what circumstances of the duel the quality of honour consisted, but have been baffled, sometimes by the diversity of cases, all said to be honourable; at other times by the opposition to correct principles in those general, but essential characteristics, which were found in every case. I must avow that I do not recollect a moment when I did not feel the practice to be censurable, though I do remember a time when I was under what I now believe to have been a very erroneous impression: that engaging in such a combat was, at least, an exhibition of courage; hence I never conceived it to be honourable. And having been upon terms of intimacy with several men of powerful mind, and generally correct feeling, and in vain sought to learn from them in what one or more circumstances of the practice honour consisted, I could never obtain any elucidation. Was it in killing your adversary? No! for honour was generally satisfied without his death, and very frequently after the discharge of a pistol which inflicted a wound upon public morality alone, the parties who previously appeared to seek mutual destruction became fast and honourable friends. Was it in violating the law? Was it in exposing one's self to be slain by an insolent aggressor? Was it all these united? Is honour then the result of blended revenge, violation of law, and wanton exposure of life to the weapon of an unreasonable opponent? To this inquiry I could obtain no better answer than that reasonable and honourable men approved of the practice and thought it necessary for preserving the decorum of society.
>
> No person can be more disposed than I am, as well from feeling as from principle, to bow with deference before the

[15] *Works* (Messmer), vol. VII, pp. 425-449.

> tribunal of such men; I am generally inclined to consider their maxims to be the dictates of the general or common sense of mankind, and since I prefer the collected experience and reasoning of the bulk of society to the results of my own weak efforts, I believe it to be the suggestion of reason, and the duty of an individual, to admit that he is not as wise as is the collective body of his fellowmen. I am, therefore, prepared to view most favourably, and with what I call a fair partiality, any practice which the great body of reasonable and honourable men, after mature reflection, and as an expression of their judgment and not of their prejudices, will say is necessary, or even useful to preserve the order of society, and the decorum of civil intercourse. But I am distinctly of opinion, that the good sense and sober judgment of the vast majority of upright and educated men are altogether opposed to the practice of duelling, as not only useless for society, but as criminal and mischievous in its results. Hence, I consider the answer which I have received to be the too hasty expression of an opinion too lightly examined, and to be founded altogether upon mistakes.

Bishop England then discussed the principles which were mooted by those who were in favor of duelling:—to avoid ignominy and to defend honor. Upon what ground, he says, can he who engages in a duel, through the fear of ignominy, lay claim to courage? His act is plainly immoral, and he offends God, because he fears the censure of men; they who possess the high moral value of fortitude will endure the taunts and reproaches of the world, and submit willingly to torture of body and inquietude of mind, rather than act against the divine law, the law of conscience, or the just regulation of society. "This is what I consider to be the true test of honour. Thus to avoid ignominy is not a motive which would justify the performance of an unlawful action; and no truly courageous man has ever yet fought from such a motive. Ignominy, as regards this practice, is a phantom to terrify the timid, to govern the weak, and to force cowards to assume the semblance of a virtue which they have not." He freely concedes that the duel for the protection of honor contains a plea in its favor which is more specious, and the popular delusion which surrounds it is stronger; his answer to the question involved in this method of defending one's honor was frequently quoted at that time by the non-Catholic press.

The hopes he expressed for the support of the Anti-Duelling Society by the "powerful aid of the daughters of Carolina in the cause of virtue and honour" were realized to some extent in his own day.

> Daughters of such mothers [he says, referring to the brave women of colonial times], are our arguments against duelling not founded upon true principles and glaring facts? Are you satisfied that the practice of duelling is one of the worst remains of pagan barbarity? Do you believe it to be unnecessary for preserving the refinement of our southern society? Then be you leaders in the sacred effort to identify law and honour, reason and the deportment of gentlemen, and to establish a wide distinction between the assertion of dignity and the indulgence of passion.

Duelling was checked for a time, but the strong sentiment of South Carolina and Georgia against the practice was evaded by participants of one State fighting their battles across the line in the other.

Bishop England has been styled by no less an authority than Chancellor Kent as the "restorer of classical learning in South Carolina." That State had been from its foundation a center for a wholesome and vigorous interest in intellectual affairs. Many of the first settlers were well-to-do planters, whose sons were given a classical education in England, and Charleston itself could boast all through the colonial period of a closer intimacy with intellectual Europe than even Boston or Philadelphia. Of one hundred and fourteen Americans admitted to the London Bar in the eighteenth century, almost half came from South Carolina. South Carolina College after 1801 was the centre of a wide influence in learning, and the classical academies that existed in the State have all honored names on the roster of their students.[16]

As intellectual ability was viewed in the first half of the nineteenth century, no man stood higher in the opinion of his fellow-citizens of the South than John England. Thus has been extinguished, wrote a non-Catholic editor on the day of Bishop England's death in 1842,

in its meridian lustre, one of the most brilliant lights of the

[16] *History of the Social Life of the Southern States*, pp. 201-202. Richmond, Va., 1902.

> Catholic Church in the Western Hemisphere, a divine who illustrated the duties of his lofty calling by his personal example—whose religious zeal was ever fervent, whose philanthropy knew no discrimination of class, sect or country, whose ability was unquestioned, whose learning was ample, whose energies knew no abatement by adverse influence, whose eloquence was prompt, enriched with the treasures of thought, and enforcing the truths of religion with equal force of argument and fervor of diction, and who has gone down to the tomb with the profound regrets of the community in which he lived, the intense sorrow of his afflicted congregation, and the agonizing grief of a large circle of friends.[17]

In the history of higher education in the South, the Philosophical and Classical Seminary of Charleston which Bishop England founded has a unique place. The training was thorough, the range of the subjects taught far broader than in any of the denominational schools, and the practical results for solid instruction beyond questioning. Bishop England has left behind in his printed works two addresses on higher learning, the first of which is entitled *On Classical Education*, delivered before the Literary and Philosophical Society of South Carolina on May 9, 1832. This is the most extended of his public discourses and one upon the composition of which he is said to have labored for several years.

The address on *Classical Education* is more clearly planned than any of his other public discourses.[18] After explaining to the large audience that had assembled to hear him his regret at being unable to appear before the Society in the past five years, owing to a long series of uninterrupted occupations in his diocese, he said that however accustomed he was to appear in public on other occasions, he was free to avow, that he was then sensible of laboring under great disadvantages. There was indeed a period when he was somewhat familiar with the topics of which he undertook to treat; but he had at that moment experimental conviction "that comparative disuse, the withdrawal of his mind to different subjects and a number of other circumstances have combined to render the task which he endeavours to discharge, far more difficult than he could have supposed."

---

[17] *Charleston Patriot*, of April 11, 1842.
[18] *Works* (Messmer), vol. VII, pp. 337-370.

It is interesting to note that this address, as well as those in 1827 and 1828, were given in the Charleston Cathedral. A large platform was erected in the centre of the middle aisle of the Cathedral, immediately in front of the main altar. Seats were placed in the sanctuary for the members of the Society. The gentlemen occupied the galleries while "the body of the church was literally crowded with a most fashionable assemblage of ladies."

The object of the address was to vindicate the utility of classical education. There are three divisions to the discourse: the importance of a regular classical education; the means of acquiring such an education; and the chief difficulties in its pursuit. Dr. England narrows his inquiry into the meaning of a classical education by distinguishing speculative and practical learning. "I am inclined to believe", he says, "that there exists much less of merely speculative learning than is generally supposed, and that what frequently receives this appellation, is but the appropriate basis upon which is raised the great superstructure of that which is practical." This theory he established by appealing to the study of mathematics, law, medicine, the natural sciences, and theology. The legislator, the physician and the surgeon, the scientist and the theologian must know the languages and the literatures of ancient civilization if they are to base their investigations upon the results of past ages and to guide their studies along lines that are in accord with the philosophy of the human mind. Dr. England admits exceptions to the rule, for all about him during those opening years of the century his auditors could point to great intellectual leaders who had not acquired their learning by means of a classical basis. But he warns the assembly against the impropriety of raising a sophism upon the fact.

Some of the objections against a classical education were not new: the decadent attitude of many scholars towards the classics; the alleged waste of time; the danger that lies in the classics of perverting the judgment, deluding and corrupting the imagination, and tainting the Christian heart.

In treating the third of these objections, Dr. England indicates the value of a classical education for directing the judgment and correcting literary taste in a passage that merits inclusion here:

If I were insensible to the varied beauties of Virgil, the

power of Demosthenes, the simplicity of Caesar, the polish of Horace, the sublimity of Homer, the wit of Lucian, the neatness of Epictetus, and the perfection of so many other models of composition; if in addition to all this, I held in no estimation men whose names have been rescued by admiring multitudes, in every age, from the grasp of death, that fame should preserve them burnished; if the structure of my mind differed so widely from that of the great bulk of my fellow-mortals and that, considering my own judgment and my own feelings the only tribunal by which I should be guided, I should find myself alone, or with few associates, I might claim indeed to be unmolested, though I could not reasonably expect to have that which was esteemed valuable destroyed, because of the singularity of my notions. There is perhaps no truth, except a palpable fact or a manifest principle, which has not some opponents; and even here, perhaps, I would be warranted in striking out the exception, for Dagoumer denied that there existed a negative proposition: and I have known an ingenious scholar who asserted that all mathematical reasoning was fallacious, because it flowed from first principles that were absurd, viz.: the definitions of a point of a line and of a superficies. Hence, the dissent of some respectable men and good scholars, united to the declaration of some unlettered though vigorous-minded writers, weighs, I believe, but lightly against the general testimony in favor of the benefits conferred by an intimate acquaintance with the select writers of antiquity; and those which remain to us are merely a selection from the mighty mass, of which the vastly greater portion has perished. Should I be asked to explain philosophically the process by which the beneficial effect is produced, I will avow that it is as far beyond my power to undertake the specific exhibition, as it would be to demonstrate the special and particular process by which I was nourished and strengthened, and my powers developed by the food which I consumed in my adolescence. I doubt whether any of our medical friends would hazard his reputation by asserting, that he could satisfy us upon the subject; or that the most speculative of our inquirers would abstain from food, until no doubt remained as to the correctness and sufficiency of the demonstration.

Respecting the tendency of these works to delude and to corrupt the imagination, or to confirm the depravity of the heart, I would beg to make a few observations. To the individual who addresses you, it has caused unmixed astonishment, when he more than once noticed this objection seriously urged, upon the ground of their tendency to gloss over the errors of

polytheism and idolatry, and thereby to diminish the esteem in which we should hold the Christian dispensation. I trust that, with some few at least, I shall find credit for the declaration, that however imperfect my practice might be, there exists not an individual who holds that dispensation in more high esteem than I do. To me it is everything. I value not the wealth, the fame, the science, the honours of the world, as worthy even for an instant to be taken into competition with the least of its appurtenances; and yet from my keenest scrutiny, from my most jealous examination, this danger has hitherto escaped notice. I will not say, that others might not have made the discovery: if they have, God forbid that I should for a moment condemn their rejection of this stumbling-block in the way of truth and life. If I could find in the annals of eighteen centuries, a single act of apostacy fairly attributable to this cause, I might hesitate. But I find the earliest and the most able advocates of Christianity generally deducing from this topic the very opposite conclusion: and, in several instances, their victory was achieved, and the cause of religion gained glorious accession by the judicious contrast. I am under the impression that this is only one of those exhibitions in which there is evidenced considerable dexterity in the use of a weapon which is wielded only for exercise or amusement. No, my friends; I cannot think so poorly of the evidences of the Christian faith, as not to feel confident that their polish is made brighter, their temper better proved, and their points better sharpened, by trying them against the defenses of opponents. Do forgive me, if I assure you that I am tempted to consider the man who would proclaim danger to Christianity from the perusal of the classics, "would", to use the strong expression of another, "have cried fire, in the days of the deluge"! Did I suppose that any one seriously entertained the apprehension, I might seriously undertake to show it was groundless.

The immoral tendency of the classics is the next ground upon which he enters, and here the experience of a score of years as a teacher stood him in good stead. He did not hesitate to assert that as an aggregate the whole collection of the classics

is as free from immoral tendency as any equal bulk of the most select literary compositions of the present day. The historian of then and now will have to relate instances of gross turpitude and crime, but surely the sacred penman has done the same; and, generally speaking, the great crimes which disgrace our nature are censured as fully and as freshly and as eloquently by the ancient classic historian, as they are by the modern. If,

sometimes, the man of yore lauds the ambitious, the proud, the revengeful, the unforgiving, such characters are praised also in our own day: the maxims of the Gospel condemn both historians alike, and form a splendid contrast to each, showing that, at both periods, man is naturally the same; and that his perfection arises not from the progress of science, the march of intellect, the accumulation of time, and the wisdom of experience, but from a source different from all these. I am under the impression, that the effusions of Cicero and of Demosthenes might be as safely read as any forensic effort, or popular harangue of the last year, within our own states. I do not argue for the perfection of the philosophy taught in the academy or in the palace; but I admire the efforts of the men, whilst I admit their mistakes, and would correct their errors whilst I point them out. I would also, where allowable, exhibit the simplicity and purity of that moral code bestowed by Heaven, in contrasting it with the doubts, the conjectures, the imperfections, and the mistakes of those merely human efforts which at once exhibit the strength and weakness of the human mind; and would establish their moral philosophy as an authentic document, to prove how necessary it was that man should learn his duties immediately from the mouth of his Creator. In the other compositions contained in this division, I feel confident that the closest scrutiny would result in the conviction, that whilst they show the unchanging principles of literary excellence in the judicious precepts, the correct observations, and the pertinent and apt illustrations which they contain, they are as thoroughly free from any moral poison as the best and purest similar productions of any period or nation.

Even the reading of the lighter classical works, such as the lyric poets, the fablists and satirists, and the mythological allegories should not, Bishop England held, be excluded from the curriculum of a classical education. And it is interesting to note that his opinion was written some three years before Abbé Gaume published the first of his works attacking the classics from the standpoint of Christian education, and that it was not till a decade after Dr. England's death that the celebrated controversy over the canker-worm, the *ver rongeur*, as Gaume called the pagan classics, occurred with Louis Veuillot on one side and Dupanloup on the other.[19] Dr. England's essay anticipated by a score of years the principle held by the famous Bishop of Orleans: that the study of the

[19]Cf. La Grange, *Vie du Mgr. Dupanloup*, in the *Correspondant* for 1852.

classics, properly taught from a Christian point of view, was neither evil nor dangerous.

In one interesting part of Dr. England's address there is a lengthy discussion on the value of the Bible as a substitute for the pagan classics. In many of the denominational schools of the colonial period, the New Testament was used as a text book in Latin or Greek, and often the question had been broached that the Bible occupy a larger share in the classical education of the young.[20] Many of the students in these Latin grammar schools and academies were being trained for the Protestant ministry, and some contended that the Bible should be made their exclusive text book in the acquirement of the classical languages. Dr. England opposed this on the score that the Bible "is not the archetype for the literary world nor a model for the compositions of business . . . I cannot believe that it could be useful or expedient to make it a substitute for the classics."

He then discusses the value of a classical education for the advancement of philosophic thought, the discoveries of natural science, and the spread of a general culture among the rising generation. The facilities for the study of the classics were many and varied in the South at the time. These facilities he would have multiplied until South Carolina had reached eminence in this respect among the States:—

> I repeat it, we have great facilities, were we industrious in turning them to account. And why should not Carolina indulge and cherish this holy ambition? This state has held a high rank for polite literature; surely she ought to complain of her sons, if, recreant to their patriotic and literary reputation, they degenerate from their fathers, and slothfully permit themselves to be surpassed by states which, within their own recollection, were only heavy forests, through which the Indian and his game could scarcely penetrate.
>
> I do cherish the expectation that they will arouse to exertion, and in their own sunny land, under their own serene sky, they will generously climb the hill of science, and cultivate to its very top; crowning its summit with those useful productions which not only will delight the eye by the richness and delicacy of their colour but will gratify the taste by the excellence of

---

[20]Brown, *The Making of our Middle Schools*, pp. 237, 277.

the fruit, and send through many leagues on every side, upon the soft yet bracing air, an odorous perfume fitted to regale the home of her children, and to attract the praise and admiration of the stranger.

Few factors in the religious life of the nation loomed larger upon the public mind during the autumn of 1834 and the winter and spring of 1835 than the wanton plundering and destruction of the Ursuline Convent and Academy at Charlestown, Massachusetts, in August, 1834. On the return journey of his second visit to Ireland (December, 1834), Bishop England brought back with him a group of Ursulines from Cork for the purpose of establishing a young ladies' academy in Charleston. The nuns reached Charleston on December 10, 1834, and took up their residence in a house near the Cathedral in Broad Street which had been prepared for their coming. Charleston was well acquainted with the Religious life of the Catholic Sisters by this time, since the Sisters of Mercy had been established in the city in 1829, and had won the esteem of all classes by their care of the sick and dying during the cholera and yellow fever epidemics which were frequent. Convent life was then the object of attack from many Protestant centers; and infamous books, such as Rebecca Reed's *Six Months in a Convent,* were being bought in such large numbers that the popular demand could not be satisfied by the publishers. Sordid books of this nature were found to be a financial success in New England and the Middle West.

Dr. England sought the opportunity offered by the reception of the first Ursuline postulant, Miss Woulfe, to give a public discourse on the *Nature of Religious Orders* which he delivered in the Cathedral of Charleston, on May 19, 1835.[21] The spirit, the purpose, the rules, and the daily life of the Ursuline Sisters had formed the subject of frenzied discussion based upon the "revelations" of Reed's iniquitous book. In vain did the robust minds among the Protestant denominations plead for sanity. The sheer fanaticism of the vulgar had been loosened from moorings built up patiently through a half-century of religious tolerance, and the sea of calumny carried as at high tide all those whose blind and mad policy was

[21] *Works* (Messmer), vol. VII, pp. 44-55.

bent upon the destruction of the Catholic cloistered life for women in the United States. Catholic leaders, Dr. England included, failed to appreciate the storm of obloquy which was being aroused by the Protestant committee which fathered the book. Ostensibly Reed's publication was for the purpose of deterring Protestant parents from educating their daughters in Catholic convents; but the attack was upon something far deeper. The *Answer* to Reed, published by the Mother Superior of the Charlestown Convent, did much to allay the storm against the religious life, but the evil of the book continued to spread, if indeed it has not spread to our own day.

Dr. England's discourse at the reception of Miss Woulfe had been announced for several weeks and was eagerly awaited by Catholics and non-Catholics in the city. The opening paragraph contains a reference to the excited state of the public mind on the cloistral life of Catholic women:

> *My dear Child*:— Under other circumstances, I should feel myself at liberty to address you differently from what I intend today. We are placed in a situation novel to us both; we are surrounded by friends to whom all that we are about to perform is new; by friends who feel a reasonable curiosity to understand that which they have never before had the opportunity of beholding, and upon whose minds, generally speaking, very extraordinary impressions have been made respecting the nature and the circumstances of that state upon which you desire to enter. They have had few, if any, opportunities of becoming acquainted with its religious lawfulness, its spiritual or social utility, its excellence, or its regulations; they have, without their own fault, been misled, but they are open to the light which a plain statement of facts is calculated to shed upon their understandings. They are desirous of information; and if they crowd around us, it is not because of an idle desire to witness an unmeaning pageant, but from the reasonable and praiseworthy motive of better understanding, from observation, that respecting which they have heard and read very strange accounts; they desire to be informed, so that they may be enabled to pass a reasonable judgment upon an interesting question.
>
> Were we about to perform this day's ceremony in the midst of a community already well instructed concerning the religious state, I should feel that it would be more appropriate to address you in the usual style on occasions of this description. To exhibit to you the wisdom of that choice, which you are likely to

make, to dwell upon the description of the virtues proper for that state to which you aspire, and to point out to you the source of those graces, by whose aid they may be successfully cultivated; but, because of the peculiarity of our circumstances, I shall omit all this, and though I shall address myself to you, the object of my remarks shall be rather to communicate, as far as our time and my ability will permit, to the friends by whom we are surrounded, such information as will render our ceremony fully intelligible, perhaps interesting. They have assembled here for the purpose of beholding a rite, of whose true nature so little is here known, and to be fully informed concerning which, is a natural and a laudable desire of all rational and unprejudiced persons. Allow me then, my dear child, to use this opportunity of satisfying their just wishes of learning, however briefly and imperfectly, the nature of our religious orders, and particularly that to become a member of which you have already made a request, which you now come forward publicly to repeat.

The principal ideas developed in this discourse are: the diversities of vocation in the Christian life; the contrast between the duties of the married state and those of the cloister; the lawfulness of the consecration of one's life to Christ in religion and the usefulness of such a consecration to society; the qualities of a religious and the meaning of the four vows of the Ursulines: poverty, chastity, obedience, and the education of young girls; the freedom of choice guaranteed and protected by the Church in entering the religious life; and the inner meaning of the ceremony of reception which was being performed that day. The Cathedral was crowded for the occasion, and Dr. England recognized in the audience many prominent persons of other faiths. Such an opportunity came too seldom even in a city where he was beloved by all, and with admirable logic he contrasts the life in the world to the peace and contentment of the cloister. The matron in the world, he explained, has duties no less valuable to society than the nun:

> Placed at the head of a family, to look after their wants, to supply their necessities, to provide for their comforts, to solace them in affliction, to sustain them, to soothe them, to heal them in sickness, to watch over the dispositions of her children, to train them to virtue, to lead them to knowledge, to educate them for fulfilment of their duties upon earth, that they may become saints in heaven, to keep her household in order, to see that

her servants be correct in their habits and diligent in their employments, to be the solace of her husband, and economist of his means, the unobtrusive instigator of his piety by the most unostentatious influence of her example, this is her high and holy calling; and one, the proper fulfilment of whose duties will leave her little time to range beyond the precincts of her family to engage herself in the concerns of others, or to undertake extraordinary practices of devotion. Her mind is, therefore, necessarily and properly occupied with that little world by which she is surrounded, in the midst of which she moves, and in the administration of which she holds so responsible a place. She owes to her husband a reasonable affection, and it is part of her obligation to please him in everything which is not forbidden by the first duties which she owes to her God.

Other women are called by God from the world to spend their lives in meditating on the things of Heaven and in devoting themselves to the service of those who may have need of their succor:

Nor have all whom God calls to this state exactly the same vocation, neither are their duties perfectly alike. With admirable wisdom he invites them to walk in various paths, so that, spreading themselves over the surface of an afflicted world, they may be differently employed in remedying its several wants. As, in forming the mystic body of his church he diversified the gifts and the functions of its several members, that he might build up the aggregate in perfection, so did he diversify the objects and the duties of the several orders in that church, whilst they are all united in the same faith, partaking of the same sacraments, obeying the same spiritual government, and are bound together in the one communion, yet they are variously employed to attain one great object. Some go forth to gather up, to cherish, and to protect the little orphan. Some devote themselves more to prayer and reflection on the word of God, like the Thesbite on Carmel, or the precursor in the desert, they love solitude and conversation with heaven. Some visit the abode of deserted poverty, to solace the afflicted, to cheer the desponding, to exhibit for those who pursue the even tenor of their way along this course in religious contentment, the entrance to beatitude, where the path of the cross terminates. Some devote themselves to the instruction of the poor, the despised, or those whom the world neglects. . . . knowing that the angels of those children see the face of their father who is in heaven, and that before him nothing is overlooked that is done for his sake, to aid one of those least ones, whose souls are created to his likeness, and are purchased by the blood of

his Son. Some are found in the abode of disease, assuaging the rage of fever, cooling the parched tongue, sustaining the languid head, whispering consolation and hope, allaying the violence of pain, encouraging to fortitude and resignation under the chastising hand of that father, who tempers justice with mercy. Or, if the portal of death is in view, and must be entered, there is the source of the Christian's hope indicated, then is the wearied pilgrim sustained, and aided, and cherished, as the radiance of immortal life is pointed out distinct, though distant, beyond the intervening gloom. Some undertake the meritorious office of educating into respectability, utility, and sanctity those children, who, in after life, must become the most useful members of society, the most valuable citizens, the best bulwarks of the state, they who contribute most to its wealth, and who enhance its respectability, the children of the industrious middle ranks of life; those in whom, generally speaking, are found most religion and morality, as they are most efficient for the public weal. Some are found in the recesses of the prison, some in the maniac's cell; some cultivate the sciences which elevate and improve, and some the arts which give to life its reasonable enjoyments. Some, too, feel the mighty importance of supplying the best, the most extended, and most polished education for those who are to move in the highest circles of society, and who should adorn, by the improvement of the understanding, the cultivation of the taste, and the decorations of their station, those virtues which impart to their example a very powerful influence.

Thus, my dear child, are the vast majority of our separated brethren, without any fault of theirs, because of the want of opportunity for information, completely in error when they imagine that the members of our religious communities are useless burdens upon society; are idle, unemployed, or if occupied in the discharge of their duties, that the avocations are unprofitable to the world at large. In fact, none of its members contribute more than they do to the well-being of society; and their disengagement from the more immediate claims of nearer connexions or relatives, makes them peculiarly fitted to supply those wants, which could never be otherwise adequately met, and very seldom attempted, without previous injustice to their own charge, by those who had first to attend to family duties. Yet it is sometimes fashionable to repeat even what is notoriously untrue, merely because it has been previously said by others. In the case, however, of our southern states, there is generally a wrong impression upon the mind, because hitherto there did not exist in those regions an opportunity for its removal; descriptions of convents written for the purposes of party were

> read; the statements of those who ought to have information were implicitly relied upon: the current of conversation naturally ran in but one channel: every doubt was swept away; and what was palpably untrue, was universally admitted as unquestionable.

We have a reference in this address, among the very few which Dr. England made during his episcopate, to his earlier life. Although he always believed in the lawfulness of religious institutions, he was, during many years of his life, far from being aware of their utility. Peculiar circumstances, at an early age, exposed him to impressions which had their traces so deeply marked as not to have been easily or speedily obliterated. The examination which he had subsequently made, he says, was conducted under the influence of prejudice and of partiality. He confesses that he did not willingly yield to the force of evidence:

> When he could no longer doubt, his assent was reluctant; when his conviction was declared, that declaration was but tardy; and when the general principle was fully admitted, his imagination figured to itself numerous exceptions; until the reflection of years, and an extensive examination of varied details, brought him at length to see fully and fairly in a proper light that picture which had so frequently appeared to him, because of his wrong position, incongruous, distorted, and ill-arranged.

It is impossible to say what caused this early attitude towards the religious orders. His own Diocese of Cork had been sadly disturbed for some years before his departure in 1820 by a quarrel over canonical rights between Bishop Moylan and the Dominicans. Yet it was during these very years (1810-1820) that Dr. England was instrumental in founding the Presentation Nuns in Cork. His sister Mary became Superioress of the North Presentation Convent a few weeks before word reached him that he had been appointed Bishop of Charleston.

To all the various objections made by the anti-Catholic press of the day against convent life, Dr. England gives copious and convincing answers. He knew his audience too well not to realize the questions many would like to ask: Are the young ladies who enter the convent free? Are they constrained by relations, friends, or guardians? What means are taken during the two years that follow

the religious reception of the candidate to ensure to the community the addition of a member who comes of her own free will? Why should a young woman not have equal liberty to follow her vocation to the cloister "as any other respectable lady shall have to make a different choice"? Should not similar protection be afforded to each? One paragraph of his answers deserves to be quoted, since it is directed towards Reed's book which was being widely read in the city:

> I am aware that it is said and printed, for I have heard and I have read the observations, that when under the influence of its ardent feeling and vivid imagination, the youthful mind devotes itself to a monastic observance, however free the individual may be at the time, she has subsequently abundant occasion for repentance, and that when the novelty has worn away, a long life of bitter disappointment follows, unless the victim is relieved by death. I might leave to your own experience to estimate the character of this assertion. But I will add, that he who addresses you has had ample opportunities upon many a shore, and in many a monastery, of seeing and conversing with all their inmates, and that he must be peculiarly ill qualified for discerning the symptoms of mental suffering, if he has ever met with one to whom the observation would correctly apply. He can only testify to what he has seen and known. He has also similar testimony from others: and the result to which he has arrived, is, that if such instances do occur, they are very rarely met with, and that not one ever came under his own observation.
>
> But how often, in what is called a state of freedom, has he found himself differently circumstanced. When called upon to perform his duty in the celebration of marriage, it is true he is bound to refuse the aid of his ministry, where he is assured that there is not a sufficient consent: yet it is not his province to inquire into the reluctance with which that consent is given, nor into the process by which it has been procured. And should he presume to interfere with the transactions of families or of individuals for such a purpose, they who now cry out against the facilities afforded for entering into religious engagements, would be first to inveigh against what they would style an inquisitorial despotism. Is all their sympathy then to be wasted upon the victim, which their imagination fancies to be immolated at the monastic shrine? And have they no tears to shed over those whom continued evidence exhibits otherwise by avarice, by ambition, and by other passions? Have they

no compassion for those who, forced by a variety of authorities or powers, are compelled, in contracting marriage, to sacrifice their own long-cherished and reasonable preferences to the caprice or to the calculations of another? Believe me, my child, when I assure you, that few moments of a ministry, extending through upwards of a quarter of a century, have been more painful to me, than when all around was gaiety, every face appeared beaming with joy, and she who gave her assent to the contract, forced herself into a seeming harmony with the circumstances; but I knew, I saw, I had previously suspected, and her own lips subsequently added their confirmation, that with a lacerated heart she yielded where she was unable to control. Many a trial of this description have I had to endure; and yet she is said to be free, and you are said to be forced! In her case I had no discretion. In yours, and in all similar cases, I have not only a discretion but an obligation to examine and to investigate, for the purpose of ascertaining the object, the motive, and the history of your desire to undertake a religious obligation, and you need not be informed that it is my duty to refuse my consent, should I have any reasonable doubt not only of your freedom, but of your anxious wish, from motives very acceptable to heaven, to embrace the institute; and should I, without such a conviction on my mind, proceed to the ceremony, I would violate the solemn obligation to which I pledged myself at the foot of the altar, on the day of my consecration. I proclaim it from this sacred place, I assert it as I shall answer for the assertion before the tribunal of the Most High, that neither my own feelings of propriety, nor my sense of justice, nor the canons of the church, would permit the engagement in religious obligations, on the part of the postulants, or of novices, with merely that quantity of liberty which suffices for engagement in the married state; and that frequently have I given my ministry at marriages, where there existed an interference with the freedom of the female, which I would no more sanction in a religious profession, than I would rush to that tabernacle, and profane its contents. Let then the deluded simpleton, whose kindness of heart is manifested by the tears which she sheds over the highly wrought tale of the novelist, spare her sympathy. They who are permitted to enter upon this state, make their choice after full deliberation and having full evidence of their freedom being equally perfect as is their knowledge of the obligations which they propose to undertake. You have given this evidence; allow me then, in the presence of this assembly, my dear child, to ask, "Are you forced?"

Early in the next year (1836) a work was issued in New York which went to greater limits in its vile attack upon the life of the Sisters in our convents. This publication, Maria Monk's *Awful Exposure*, was "greedily received and read perhaps more widely than any book ever before published in the country."[22]

It is to the credit of a city bearing the same name as that which had by this time come to be considered as the typical example of the results of anti-Catholic mobocracy, that during all the time the Ursulines directed their Academy for Young Ladies in Charleston, no hesitancy was ever shown by non-Catholic parents in confiding the education of their daughters to these noble women whose educational ideals had placed them among the leaders of high school and collegiate directors of feminine education. The Ursulines of Canada, founded by Mother Marie de l'Incarnation, in 1639, were then rounding out two centuries of devotion to the education of young girls, while the Ursulines of New Orleans had already passed the centennial of their foundation in the old French city (1727). The Ursulines, who founded the earliest convents in the United States (New York, 1812; Charlestown, Massachusetts, 1817; Charleston, South Carolina, 1834), were from Ireland, and were the forerunners of what is today one of the largest congregations of religious women in the United States.[23] The subsequent history of the Charleston Ursulines is treated in a later chapter.

"It is now a good number of years since I have written and delivered a discourse", Bishop England wrote to the Washington Light Infantry of Charleston, when its committee requested a copy of the Bishop's address of February 22, 1838, on *The Character of George Washington*.[24] "I almost always", he added, "for the last twenty years, have spoken without committing what I speak to writing." His address on the first President of the United States is largely a biographical one with an appeal to the members of the Washington Light Infantry to be worthy of the exalted name they had borne for over thirty years:

---

[22]Shea, *op. cit.*, vol. III, p. 510.

[23]*Life of Saint Angela Merici, by the Abbé Parenty; with an Account of the Order in Ireland, Canada, and the United States*, by John Gilmary Shea. Philadelphia, 1857.

[24]*Works* (Messmer), vol. VII, pp. 303-336.

Gentlemen of the Washington Light Infantry! you may be justly proud of the name under which you are enrolled. But let it be to you, also, a solemn admonition to fulfil your obligations. Our volunteer companies are not formed for the mere purpse of idle show, of vain parade, nor for empty pageantry. The natural and safest bulwark of our country's freedom is a well-organized militia; the chivalry of that militia should be found in the volunteer companies. Yours bears the most glorious name for an American citizen-soldier. You should emulate the bravest, the best-disciplined, the most patriotic of those marshalled in your country's service. You should endeavour, with the noble rivalship of a soldier's honour, but with a soldier's affection, to permit no other company to outstrip you in the accomplishments of the armed citizen. For your country and its freedom; for your country and its institutions; for your own sunny South; and for the whole Union; for its peace and for its right; for your morals, for your discipline; and in that discipline the first and last point, obedience to your officers! Never has your company exhibited any deficiency in this respect, and, therefore, it has always been efficient and respectable. You glory in the name of American, but you receive as Americans every one whom the laws of your country recognize as such. You have not deserted your posts, because the fellow-countrymen of him who led your armies to the walls of Quebec placed themselves by your side, to make common cause with you for that land which their acceptance of your conditions, made your common country. France, Germany, Ireland, and Scotland muster by your side, and with them you form a band of brothers; uniting, as your Washington has done, your whole force for an irresistible protection. Do not those flags wave over men who love to gather round your stars, to be guided by your eagle? When you volunteered to protect our brethren in Florida, were not the Germans your companions? Did not the Irish penetrate into its swamps. But why do I thus address you! Our generous South has fully imbibed the spirit of our hero; and we know not these mischievous distinctions. A man loves not less the home of his choice, because he recollects the spot where he first breathed. The soldier's contest of emulation is then noble, for it is equally free from the meanness of jealousy, as it is from the folly of miserable and mischievous distinctions. Nor did I need the proof which you have given, by affording me this day's opportunity of addressing you, to be convinced that the Washington Light Infantry possess largely that liberal sentiment which pervades all our companies, and most of our citizens.

Franklin College, the nucleus of the present University of Georgia situated at Athens in that State, was a center of culture and of classical education from its foundation in 1801. The South had just witnessed the passing (July 21, 1840) of one of its most noted teachers, Dr. Moses Waddell, whose Academy at Willington had been the training ground for some of the prominent men of the times: John C. Calhoun, Judge A. B. Longstreet, Governor Patrick Noble, Governor McDuffie, William H. Crawford, who in 1824 came near gaining the Presidency of the United States, Hugh Legare, and James L. Petigru, these two latter being friends and legal advisers of Bishop England.[25] Dr. England's next public discourse was *On the Pleasures of the Scholar*, delivered before the Demosthenian and Phi Kappa Societies of Franklin College, on August 5, 1840.[26]

Dr. England bases his thesis—the pleasures of a knowledge of the classics—upon the practical results of scholarship. The first of these is the necessity of mental relaxation. "Whatever position it may be your lot to occupy in the employment of the world, you will need to apply the energies of your mind to the proper discharge of its duties. The grave study of the law, the deep reflection of medical science, the absorbing cares of political life, the intense application of business, the deep interest of your family concerns, your sympathy for friends, and a thousand other importunate demands will draw largely upon your time and your feelings, and will compel exertion: but you will also feel the necessity of relaxation. So that, in fact, its regulation is one of the most important concerns of life; and the neglect of its arrangement is pregnant with the most disastrous consequences to youth and to manhood."

The danger youth always runs in seeking relaxation from life's growing cares and responsibilities requires for its control certain restraints of mind and body. At a time when the desire of novelty is great, he says, when under the alluring names of liberty and independence, wholesome restraints are easily laid aside and the buoyant spirit of youth loves indulgence, cunning self-interest frequently bestows the name of necessary recreation upon those pursuits which degrade and destroy, and thus seduce the generous and the inexperienced into habits which are easily formed, but which it

[25]Meriwether, *History of Higher Education in South Carolina*, pp. 40-41.
[26]*Works* (Messmer), vol. VII, pp. 371-394.

requires time, labor, and perseverance to overcome. "This is one of the most copious sources of intoxication, of licentiousness, of idleness, and of dissipation; by these the peace, the honour, the property, and the respectability of families are destroyed, and they who might have been the ornaments of their state and the benefactors of their race, sink dishonoured to an early grave, occasioning grief and drawing tears from their survivors, not so much for their departure, but because of their havoc and their disgrace."

The relaxations of pagan nations, he explained at length, were for the most part characterized by their vulgarity, their cruelty, or their licentiousness; and unless the men and women of civilized Christian nations were prepared in their youth to follow a rational mode of relaxation, the evils of paganism would surely reappear. "Relaxation *is*, then, necessary for man, but whilst he indulges in it to a proper extent, he should avoid the pernicious, degrading, and ruinous modes which too often present themselves to persons of every age, and to which inexperienced, ardent, and innocent youth, is unfortunately allured by the most wily blandishments. Our recreations should be suited to the place we occupy, and made to subserve the improvement of ourselves as well as the interests of the community."

One of the secondary objects of a good collegiate education, Dr. England says, is

> to afford to men of improved minds and cultivated taste one of the best resources for the purposes alluded to: one of the greatest mistakes usually made by our educated men was, casting aside as useless after their graduation, the books to whose study they had been kept for so many years. It is, indeed, in a great degree natural, that having theretofore regarded them as instruments of task-work, and that frequently of no light description, the mind now rejoicing in its emancipation, should view them as a liberated prisoner would the manacles from which he was relieved. This, however, is not a correct estimate. They should rather be considered as the means by whose use the mind has become greatly enriched...
>
> I have known men, who, during protracted lives, found in the cultivation of classical literature that relaxation which improved, whilst it relieved the mind. The last survivor of those who pledged their lives and fortunes, and nobly redeemed their sacred honour in the achievment of our glorious inheritance of liberty, was a striking instance of this. When nearly four-

score years had passed away from the period of his closing the usual course of classical education after the perils of a revolution, after the vicissitudes of party strife, when the decay of his faculties warned him of the near aproach of that hour when he should render an account of his deeds to that Judge who was to decide his fate for eternity, from his more serious occupation of prayer and self-examination, and from the important concern of managing and dividing his property, would Charles Carroll of Carrollton turn for refreshment to those classic authors with whom he had been familiar through life: his soul would still feel emotion at the force of Tully's eloquence or melt at Virgil's pastoral strain. Perhaps the very selection in early life of this, as the best mode of mental indulgence, tended much to insure to him, not only his patriarchal age, but the calm and serene frame of mind which was also well calculated to preserve health and to promote longevity. When the young man is thus occupied and enjoys the literary gratification, he is less disposed to search for that society or to rush into those indulgences, which, whilst they destroy the powers of the mind, undermine the vigour of the constitution, are the prelude to years of remorse and to a life of difficulties. This relaxation is unquestionably very rational, perfectly dignified, and would, I have no doubt, be found eminently useful by all who would adopt it.

The study of the classics of Greece and Rome is not simply an exercise to become acquainted with their dead languages, but to open up to the minds of the young the vast vistas of knowledge which the ancients possessed and which they so marvelously stored away in their writings. The whole of ancient history, the wide range of pagan mythology, the knowledge of geography, the profound wisdom of the old pagan philosophers, the science of archeology: these are mainly, as Dr. England says, the chief fields of learning to which the classics are the surest vestibule. In the exercise of the imagination, in the creation of the poetic instinct, in literary composition, and in the study of the human mind, the classics are indispensable.

Here and there in this address are passages that attract the eye and the ear with their beauty:

> On an afternoon in the early period of the summer, a few years since, I stood upon a balcony where the country-seat of Cicero overhung an eminence. The air was soft yet bracing; Gaeta was at a little distance on my left, the blue Mediterranean

rippled at a distance on the southwestern border, groves of orange and of lemon trees filled a large portion of the plain which stretched below towards the shore, and their delicious perfume arose mingled with that of many other delicate odours from the gardens and the herbs. It was like the richness of his own eloquence. But where was the orator? It was through the pathways of that plain he was pursued. It was near that blue wave he descended from his litter, thence was his head borne to the cruel Anthony. Need I remind you of Fulvia's revenge? And even in the midst of the disastrous estrangements and the cruel hatred of faction and of party contest, the very populace of Rome wept at beholding the head and the hand of their once-loved defender exhibited upon the very rostrum where they hung upon his lips.

To the Georgians who listened to him that sunny afternoon in August, 1840, there was a singular appeal in the fact that this Catholic bishop, the head in their State of a Church which was being then vilified by many of their coreligionists in all parts of the country, should plead with them not to neglect the higher things of the mind in the pursuit of wealth and worldly goods:

At the period of the confederation, Georgia was the youngest amongst her sisters. She now beholds as many states succeeding her on the catalogue as there were originally united. Yet a large portion of her territory has been only lately placed in the hands of her citizens. Immense bodies of her finest soil are yet unbroken by the cultivator, her rivers are not cleared, nor is her mineral wealth explored. We know that rich veins are concealed beneath her surface, but their value is scarcely appreciated, nor can the mind yet estimate their extent. The spirit of her sons and the wisdom of her councils have already made her the high-road by which not only her own products and imports will be rapidly conveyed, but by which nations and their wealth must be transported. Let it be so with her literature. Let her University be generously sustained! Let her children devote their leisure hours to polite and scientific recreation! Her riches will be developed, the cultivation of her taste will decorate her amongst her sisters, her hidden treasures will be explored from the east and from the west, from the north and from the south, will she be visited, admired and enriched by contribution. And as she rises in the scale of political and commercial importance, so shall she be elevated in scientific and literary fame.

On May 6, 1841, Bishop England sailed from Charleston for Boston, whence he was to depart on what was to be his last voyage

to Europe. President Harrison died on April 4, and on the thirteenth, President Tyler issued a proclamation to the people of the United States, recommending that Friday, May fourteenth, be observed throughout the land as a day of fasting and prayer in order "to impress all minds with a sense of the uncertainty of human things, and of the dependence of Nations, as well as of individuals, upon our Heavenly Parent." On his arrival in Boston, Bishop Fenwick, who had been Dr. England's adviser during the first year of his episcopate in Charleston, asked him to deliver the eulogy on Harrison that day in the Cathedral of the Holy Cross. The Boston *Transcript* of the following day speaks of it as

> a discourse eloquent, brilliant, and powerful, and critical, completely and intensely imbued with the pure and holy spirit of Heaven-born charity and kindness . . . . ..Verily, it is not strange that the Right Rev. Gentleman should command the admiration and esteem of all who hear him, Protestants as well as Catholics. Let but the doctrines of Christian Charity and tolerance be as beautifully, impressively, and fervently inculcated, by every preacher of the Gospel throughout Christendom, as on this occasion by Bishop England, and we should soon see an end of the sectarian uncharitableness which has so long dimmed the glories of Christianity and caused the true disciples of our Saviour who would, if possible, live in peace with all men to lament and mourn.[27]

Of this discourse, which lasted two hours and a half, we have but a mere abstract, written down hurriedly before he sailed on May 16, 1841. It is entitled *On American Citizenship,* and it is regrettable that we do not possess the whole discourse, for it would undoubtedly be helpful in understanding the strident anti-Catholic controversy during the presidential campaign of 1840.[28] Dr. England refers to this in an opening paragraph of his discourse:

> After a contest peculiarly marked by vigorous contention, we behold it settled in the one constitutional way; we beheld the man who was the choice of a majority of the states and the people, raised to a station so high that the monarchs of the old world might envy it, we saw him take the solemn oath prescribed for his office, and about to enter upon the more active discharge of his duties, and we then beheld him in a moment stricken down, as it were, by an arrow from the grave. We have seen the

[27]Cited in the *Cath. Misc.*, vol. XX, p. 374.
[28]*Works* (Messmer), vol. VII, pp. 66-75.

> calculations and the hopes of those who had for years deliberated and toiled, baffled and overthrown at the very moment when they seemed to be fully realized; the cup that was already lifted to the lip dashed from the hand and twenty-six independent, though connected republics, astounded by an event as unexpected as it was unforeseen! We see every child of the republic weeping for the death of a common father, forgetting their dissensions, their divided interests, their clashing opinions, and compelled to feel how impotent are the exertions of man unless they be ratified by God. They and we are approaching today our holy altars, to the end that we may so repent of our sins, that we may have peace and prosperity bestowed upon us by Heaven. We pray to God that he may protect and bless us, and so prosper our endeavours, that our country may be enabled to take and maintain her high place among the nations of the earth, so that peace may be our crown here, and happiness our reward hereafter.

The trend of the whole discourse, as far as can be gathered from the ten pages that have survived is that true patriotism can find its basis only in religion, and that in a land such as America the only safeguard of true patriotism is toleration in religious affairs. It was this spirit of toleration, he said, which

> caused the healthy action of the infant republic; but, unfortunately, we have seen in later times a disposition to forget the great lesson thus inculcated, and to revert to a persecuting spirit. I care not from what this arose, under what pretext it was urged, by what reasons or excuses it was defended or palliated! It is lamentable that in any man it should be found to exist. But wherever it does exist, its evils are twofold. It injures him who cherishes it, and him who is its victim. In the one, it engenders a spirit of domination over his fellow, and in the other, a perpetual temptation to hatred and revenge. It is a spirit which separates brother from brother, and induces mutual distrust. It may even graft itself upon political feeling or partisanship, it may cause political principles to be blended with religious distinction, and then we have at once a union of church and state, the antagonist of civil liberty.

The American newspapers had been flooded for a decade of years with the time-worn cry that Catholicism was incompatible with the Republic's safety. Dr. England had already written what amounts to several volumes in his published works with this charge in mind. He now answers it again in terms understood by the people of Boston:

> In a large portion of the civilized world, charges are pre-

valent against the Catholic religion as being incompatible with civil and religious liberty. On what are their charges founded! From the pages of history it is said that the Roman Catholic religion is at war with the spirit of republicanism. But allow me to ask in what way? The principle of republicanism is the equality of men. We teach that all Christians have a common Parent, that all are equally redeemed by the blood of the Saviour, that all must appear before a common God who knows no distinction of persons, where, then, is the inconsistency? Look through the records of the world, and see where the principles of true republicanism are first to be found. They had their origin in Christianity, and their earliest instance is in the church of which we are members. Her institutions are eminently republican. Her rulers are chosen by the common consent, her officers are obliged to account strictly to those over whom they preside, her guide is a written constitution of higher force than the will of any individual. What call you this? Aristocracy? Monarchy? It is republicanism. Look again. Where were the bulwarks found that stayed the ravages of the barbarians of the North, when they devastated the south of Europe? In the republican Catholic States of Italy. Go to a nation still more familiar to you; search the pages of English history. One strain pervades them all, a perpetual assault upon the memory of the prelates of the Catholic Church. Charges are brought that they were overbearing, haughty and tyrannical. Where are the proofs? There are none. Go to the Records of Parliament, and you will find the same thing there. Look at Britain in more ancient times, before the Norman conquest. One of her kings went to Rome, he addressed the Pope, and requested of him a code of laws for the government of his realm. What was the answer of this haughty, tyrannical, all-grasping potentate, who is represented as having his foot upon the necks of kings and emperors? It may even now be found in her archives. "I can give you principles, but not laws. Your duty as a monarch is to consult your men of wisdom, acquainted with the wishes and necessities of your people; regulate your conduct by their advice, but govern your land in your own way. Nations differ widely, and that which is proper for one might be highly injurious to another." The principles of the common law, that mighty fabric in which English liberty is said to reside, have been traced back to the Catholic Church. In this, then, is the germ of liberty to be found. After the Norman conquests, then, it was that the conqueror dictated to his captives his own laws. But who refused to bow down in tame submission to his usurpations? The bishops of England were the

men. They rested their claims upon the ancient compact; they took the laws of Alfred and of Edward, and from these demanded of the conqueror himself an acknowledgment of the rights secured to the people by Edward. And when the base hypocrite, John, endeavoured still more closely than before to fetter the people, it was the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the bishops of England, that resisted his power. At the field of Runneymede, they wrung from his reluctant hand the Magna Charta, which is regarded as the English constitution, but which is only a part of what the people enjoyed under the laws of Alfred.

These are the men who have been stigmatized as proud, as haughty, as ambitious. They were ambitious, just as your Hancocks were ambitious, just as your Warrens were ambitious, just as your Montgomerys were ambitious, just as those other men were ambitious who pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honour, to the support of that declaration whose successful maintenance wrested from the monarch of England the political rights which we now enjoy. But the historians of England, even while the word of liberty was upon their lips, filled their pages with misrepresentations of the principles of the Catholic prelates, and calumnies upon their characters. Why was this? Because the Catholic religion was proscribed by law. Hence it is, that the pages of history have been garbled and distorted by the British historian, because the Catholic prelates resisted to the utmost the unjust encroachments of the British kings. The history of the American colonies, before they became an independent nation, more especially during the earlier years of their settlement, exhibits marked indications of the same spirit of intolerance towards the Catholic religion; and this, too, on the part of those who themselves fled to this continent as a refuge from religious persecution. In this we find the explanation why, for generation after generation, the same charges against Catholicism have been made—because the same dynasties have been set up, and its opposition has been the same to all. But if we endeavour to correct this source of evil, if we say "let history be divested of its prejudices and misrepresentations; let education be separated from sectarianism: let the truth alone be recorded and taught"—then are we told—we have been told—that we are turbulent and discontented. Even in this country attempts have been made to divide the republic on account of religious differences—but, thank Heaven! the public mind is becoming more and more enlightened on this point, and men are beginning to perceive that the greatest curse which could befall our country, would be the encouragement

of any spirit of sectarian persecution. Let us beseech God in his infinite mercy to avert from us all such spirit of uncharitableness and unkindness. Before Heaven, let us always avoid it. Let us be a band of brothers as to our common rights—as to our religious differences, let us bury them. Would to God that we may always act in this manner—that we may overcome the spirit of our nature, and imbibe only the spirit of Christian charity. Oh! that we all may, with reference to our opponents, enter into the blessed spirit of that prayer, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." Let us, then, endeavour with all our might to reduce these principles to practice, and in the discharge of our duty to the republic, regard it as a duty to God. Thus shall we achieve the great object of our constitution—thus shall we obtain of God his blessing. If we are assailed from abroad, let us join together as a band of brothers to repel the assault. Thus shall peace, and happiness, and prosperity reign among us—thus shall we be contented with the things and the liberty given to us in this transitory scene, having our eyes fixed on the better things and the true liberty, promised to us in Heaven, as the children of God.

In publishing Dr. England's *Works* in 1849, Father Hewit prefixes to this last discourse a remark to the effect that, from the testimony of some of the best judges of eloquence of the day, "the eulogiums which have been accorded to Dr. England as an orator were all fully merited... It is often impossible to transfer and to perpetuate the highest efforts of eloquence upon paper."

Nothing is more evanescent than eloquence, and hence Dr. England's powers as a public speaker must be judged from those who heard him. The newspapers of the day acclaimed him as one of the greatest, if not the greatest, pulpit orator in America. At times the account given of Dr. England's influence over a public gathering goes beyond moderation, and he is hailed as the Chrysostom of the West. The Catholic newspapers are naturally more restrained. Perhaps the best of these encomiums is that which appeared in the Boston *Pilot*, a few days after Bishop England's departure for Europe (May 22, 1841):

> The visit of this distinguished Catholic prelate to our city, has created an excitement honorable alike to the eminent divine, and to our Catholic community. Thus the community generally were on the *qui vive*, when it was announced that he would preach on Friday last, the national fast, proclaimed by the President. The church was filled, and all were impressed with

his perspicuous and forcible style of oratory. It was indeed a discourse glowing with the purest and most enlightened spirit of a Christian citizen. He passed an eloquent eulogium upon the institutions of our country, and throughout evinced the most liberal and forgiving sentiments towards a certain class in Massachusetts who have given us but little reason to entertain for them kindly feelings. He preached again on Sunday during forenoon service. His sermon occupied two hours and a quarter; it was the most brilliant discourse it has ever been our pleasure to listen to from any pulpit. None but those who listened to it can have the remotest conception of its surpassing eloquence and power; close, logical, and perspicuous; abounding in allegorical pictures of thrilling and overpowering interest; at times hurrying on rapidly with the enumeration of the distinctive features of the Catholic Faith; again calm, majestic, argumentative, convincing. He played not lightly with the common proofs of Catholicity; but grasped its great truths, the basis of the divine structure; and overthrew, with the clearness of a mind of transcendant power, the sophisms of those who have arrayed themselves against the Church of Rome. We will not attempt to give a sketch of the discourse; to do so would be a vain and futile undertaking;—its irrefutable positions, and the exalted powers of reasoning of the orator, may be reduced to paper; but the deep, impassioned earnestness, the majestic eloquence, the eye kindled with the fire of divine truth, the form rising with the lofty conceptions of the mind, and the mute eloquence of the countenance, are characteristic of the sermon, that none but those who saw, can know. The church was filled to its utmost capacity, and we were pleased to see some of our most distinguished citizens present and listening with the most riveted attention to the Bishop, during his lengthy discourse. Indeed, it is impossible that it could have been otherwise; for he possesses the rare power of seizing upon the minds of his hearers, and enchanting them with the force and purity of his eloquence.

In the century that has passed since John England was at the zenith of his powers, Catholics in the United States have shared with their fellow-citizens of other creeds many ecclesiastics of their Faith who have been gifted with exceptional ability in bringing to the hearts of the nation the message of religion and of the religious basis underlying American social and political life. To many of these eloquent orators and writers, if not to all, the printed works of Bishop England have been a source and an inspiration;

and it is not an exaggeration to state that none of our Church leaders has surpassed the first Bishop of Charleston in eloquence, in cogency of reasoning, or in keen appreciation of the American mind and heart.

CHAPTER XX

The Address Before Congress

January 8, 1826

Among Bishop England's public discourses the one which easily ranks first in importance is his address before Congress, delivered in the House of Representatives, on Sunday, January 8, 1826, in the presence of President John Quincy Adams and a crowded assembly of Senators and Representatives.

The cause of such an unusual occasion was simple enough in itself.

At the consecration of Bishop Benedict Fenwick, S. J., the successor to Bishop Cheverus, in the Baltimore Cathedral, November 1, 1825, the Bishops of Philadelphia and Charleston were co-consecrators with Archbishop Maréchal, the only time these three leaders of the American Church were to meet. Between Dr. Conwell and Dr. England there could be little sympathy, owing to the former's part, as we have seen, in lessening the good repute of the young Bishop of Charleston in the estimation of the Sacred Congregation. With the Archbishop Dr. England could expect even less sympathy, for they were opposed upon what we now know was so essentially necessary for religious peace and discipline—the convocation of a national synod. All, however, were united in admiring the resolute, sturdy, and sunny character of Boston's new bishop. Benedict Fenwick was the nineteenth bishop in the chronology of the American hierarchy, and the fourth native American to be raised to the episcopate. Dr. England preached at his consecration, and then accompanied him to Boston for his installation. This ceremony took place on December 4, 1825, and again Bishop England preached. The *Catholic Miscellany* was not published from December 1825, until July, 1826, and we have no record of the sermon. It was rumored in Boston at the time that Bishop Plessis of Quebec was ill. He died the following day, December 5, 1825, and it would be interesting to know whether Dr. England mentioned the Quebec prelate who was the first Apostolic Delegate to the American Church and

INTERNATIONAL CHRISTIAN
GRADUATE UNIVERSITY

who had guided the first three Archbishops of Baltimore in many serious ecclesiastical affairs. Dr. England did not remain long in Boston but returned by stage to New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore on his way home. Christmas Day found him occupying the pulpit of St. Patrick's Church, in Washington, taking for his text some anti-Catholic phrases from Adams' Fourth of July oration in 1821. The sermon caused considerable comment in the capital, since it was virtually a rebuttal to the President's well-known prejudices towards the Catholic Faith.

During Dr. England's first visit to the North in 1821, he had remained for a few days in Washington and had been kindly received by President Monroe and by John Quincy Adams, then Secretary of State. Adams was a thorough New Englander in his likes and dislikes and among the objects of his disfavor was the Catholic Church. In spite of his long public service, his constant opportunities to meet Catholics in all walks of life, and his knowledge of international affairs in which the Church figured so largely, the sixth President of the United States carried to the grave a colonial attitude towards Catholicism.

The oration, to which Dr. England admits that he made reply, and which was delivered on July 4, 1821, at Washington, when Adams was Secretary of State, is not a remarkable one for so clever a scholar; and the allusions it makes to Catholicism are couched in the prejudices prevailing at the time.[1] The Church was not then known, even in educated circles, and the knowledge of its political and social history was largely colored by the sweeping generalizations of the anti-Catholic literature which was popular in colonial America and among later Americans who preserved the colonial temperament. Apparently the subject of Mr. Adams' speech was Church and State. The object he had in view was to point out the

[1]The oration will be found in *Niles Register*, vol. VIII, no. 515, July 21, 1821, pp. 326-332. In this connection it may be interesting to add that several traditions of anti-Catholic attacks by Adams are still current in Catholic circles. One of these is to the effect that, on the occasion of the laying of the cornerstone of the Cincinnati Observatory, on Mt. Adams, in 1843, ex-President Adams expressed the hope that the observatory should be "a beacon of true science that should never be obscured by the dark shadows of superstition and intolerance symbolized by the Popish Cross." In the printed speech this sentiment is not found, and Lamott (*History of the Archdiocese of Cincinnati*, p. 139, note) avers that the charge of intolerance against Adams on this occasion cannot be sustained.

contrast between the ages when Catholicism was the dominant religion of the world and the new life of religious freedom in the United States. American democracy was contrasted to "that pretentious system of despotism and of superstition which, in the name of the meek and humble Jesus, had been spread over the Christian world." In the conflict between the crown and the miter, Adams said, man had no rights. "Neither the body nor the soul of the individual was his own. From the impenetrable gloom of this intellectual darkness, and the deep degradation of this servitude, the British nation had partially emerged." But all through her history, Britain was "stifled by the principles of subserviency to ecclesiastical usurpation", until the first step in progress towards freedom came through the "religious reformation." Among those to whom the world owed gratitude for the emancipation of the mind from ecclesiastical slavery Adams cites John Hus, Wycliffe, and Martin Luther, whose purpose is described as follows:

> The corruptions and usurpations of the church were the immediate objects of these reformers; but, at the foundation of all their exertions, there was a single, plain, and almost self-evident principle, that man has a right to the exercise of his own reason. It was this principle which the sophistry and rapacity of the church had obscured and obliterated, and which the intestine divisions of the same church itself first restored. The triumph of reason was the result of inquiry and discussion. Centuries of desolating wars have succeeded, and oceans of human blood have flowed for the final establishment of this principle; but it was from the darkness of the cloister that the first spark was emitted, and from the arches of an university that it first kindled into day. From the discussion of religious rights and duties, the transition to that of the political and civil relations of men with one another, was natural and unavoidable; in both the reformers were met by the weapons of temporal power. At the same glance of reason, the tiara would have fallen from the brow of priesthood, and the despotic sceptre would have departed from the hand of royalty, but for the sword by which they were protected, that sword which, like the flaming sword of the Cherubim, turned every way to debar access to the tree of life.
>
> The double contest against the oppressors of the church and state, was too appalling for the vigor, or too comprehensive for the faculties of the reformers of the European continent. In

> Britain alone, was it undertaken, and in Britain but partially succeeded.
>
> It was in the midst of that fermentation of the human intellect which brought right and power in direct and deadly conflict with each other, that the rival crowns of the two portions of the British Island were united on the same head. It was then that, released from the manacles of ecclesiastical domination, the minds of men began to investigate the foundations of civil government. But the mass of the nation surveyed the fabric of their institutions as it existed in fact. It had been founded in conquest; it had been cemented in servitude and so broken and moulded had been the minds of this brave and intelligent people to their actual condition, that instead of solving civil society into its first elements in search of their rights, they looked back only to conquest as the origin of their liberties, and claimed their rights but as donations from their kings.

These were popular theses of political science at the beginning of the last century, and Bishop England faced an audience, representative in some ways of the intellectual wealth of the nation, to which such sentiments were axioms of judgment in all matters in which the Catholic Church was concerned. He was well aware, he confesses, that it would be very difficult to discuss the topics raised by President Adams' speech, since he knew that the underlying historical facts of pre-Reformation times "were not generally well understood in the United States, from the want of opportunity, and that amongst some of the best informed and the best disposed citizens." He had also frequently found in discussing the historic past of Catholics with leading Catholics "serious mistakes regarding the tenets of the Roman Catholic Church in their regard", and he believed he would be promoting good feeling and harmony by using the unique opportunity given to him that Sunday morning, if he strove to explain those mistakes.

The invitation to clergymen of ranking ability to preach before Congress was a frequent occurrence; but, apart from Father Gabriel Richard's speeches in the House of Representatives three years before, when he was Michigan's delegate to Congress, no Catholic priest had been heard in that assembly. Careful to avoid further misunderstanding with the Archbishop, Dr. England wrote and obtained Maréchal's permission to accept the invitation. What his own feelings were can be seen in a letter, written a few weeks later

(January 29) from Fayetteville, North Carolina, to his friend Judge Gaston:

I directed the publisher of the sketch of what I preached at the Capitol to send to you & to my friend Judge Taylor copies from me. You will find only what you have often heard from myself, but I thought you would like to see in print what would bear better to be heard than to be read. Perhaps I might have been the humble instrument of removing some prejudices. If so, I am more than repaid.

Without seeking for the occasion, or feeling myself upon the topics until I had gone too far to recede, & then, & only then, my eyes rested upon Mr. Adams, I on Christmas day met foot to foot the 4th of July oration in which he so unkindly assailed us four years since. I then as cooly & as firmly as I could did my utmost, & I am told by many, with sufficient success. The next Wednesday I was at his levee, where I was received in a very flattering manner, & upon arrival at home found a card for dinner on the succeeding Saturday. We had much conversation upon several topics, & a little about yourself, in which he appeared to think it news that you were a Popish church warden.

On the day I filled the Speaker's chair I was indeed a show, & all Washington must have thought so, for the throng was so great that the President found it very difficult to get in, & when in, much more so to get a seat. Upon my arrival, nearly half an hour after, I found vast numbers returning without a hope of getting upstairs, so as even to see in,—& for once I must own I felt ashamed at hearing my own name proclaimed by my friends Haynes & Hamilton of S. C., who formed my bodyguard, whilst in all the pomp of Prelacy I struggled through and heard the proclamation renewed still to make way for me to enter. If I could blush, I am convinced I then did, because I had some unusual sensation of heart and some unwonted glow in my cheek and on my forehead. When I was done I certainly felt a very extraordinary gratification at the intense attention with which I was heard, & that every face seemed to say "go on". But I thought two hours enough for them & for me,—I made the sign of the cross, & my gratification was indeed increased by the vast & respectable portion of the assembly that exhibited its Faith. You will, perhaps, smile at my saying that even elevated as I was, I could not forget that I once was an insignificant being, & I vouchsafed to come down from my seat to recognize the President of the United States & converse a little with him.

Do not think me vain or childish in this; I know you would wish to learn, even if you did not care for the individual, what

was the first appearance of a Catholic clergyman before the legislature of the union & I could not write thus to another.

I love your countrymen more as I know them better. They are a well-disposed, religiously-inclined people; there is but one true Church, & that is the Roman Catholic; but how can they believe without evidence?—they have never received it. They must be instructed, not abused. They must be expostulated with, not quarrelled with. They are not obstinate heretics —they are an enquiring, thinking, reasoning, well-disposed, I will add, a pious people,—& God will bless them & bring them to truth. I every day see abundant evidence to support me in this position, & to some of your apparently accidental remarks I owe much of the reflection which has led me to know how to appreciate their character & to aid in removing their prejudices. I hope long to profit by many more of them & for many years of more frequent intercourse.[2]

The day following the delivery of his address, a group of his hearers wrote to Dr. England soliciting its publication. To this request he replied:

To the Hon. Messrs. Condict, Hobart, and so forth.

Gentlemen:— I have just received your very flattering request, that I should publish the sermon which I delivered yesterday in the Hall of Representatives.

I should very gladly comply immediately therewith if it were in my power. But I have not written, nor have I taken a note of my discourse.

I understand that some gentleman who was present took notes. I shall endeavour to discover if such was the fact, and with the aid of his manuscript, I should easily be certain of being substantially correct. Otherwise I should only be able to give such an outline of my argument as would bear a similarity to what I delivered.

My duties call me hence immediately. But I shall do what lies in my power to meet your wishes.

I have the honour to remain, gentlemen, with respect and esteem,

Your obedient, humble servant,

✠ JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*[3]

---

[2]*Records* (ACHS), vol. XX, pp. 104-106.

[3]*Works* (Messmer), vol. VII, pp. 9-10). The other names attached to the request were: Ebenezer Tucker: *N. J.;* Joshua Sands, J. Sloane, Joseph Vance, C. A. Wickliffe: *Ky.;* Enoch Lincoln, Adam Alexander: *Tenn.;* William McLean, Samuel Swan: *N. J.;* D. Trimble, Lewis Condict: *N. J.;* Aaron Hobart: *Mass.;* Thomas Whipple: *N. H.;* James Wilson: *Penn.;* B. Bassett, A. Stewart, George Wolf, G. Mitchell: *Md.;* William Burleigh, Phineas Markley, Noyes Barber.

Dr. England was obliged to leave for Baltimore before he could carry out this promise, and he wrote to a friend, William Hickey, asking him to procure a copy of the notes of his speech made by the reporters of the House. Meanwhile he began marshalling his recollections of what he always considered a memorable occasion in his life and putting these on paper. Mr. Hickey wrote on January 10, that no official notes had been taken, owing to the absence through illness of Mr. Stansbury, the recorder of debates, but that he would collect whatever notes had been made. With the aid of these Dr. England completed the writing of his address from memory and it was given (January 16) to the printer to be published in pamphlet form.[4]

The discourse itself is one of the most carefully prepared of all Dr. England's writings.[5] It needs to be read in extenso to be fully appreciated; only then can the splendid courage of the Charleston prelate be properly estimated.

> The peculiar circumstances in which I find myself placed in this respectable assemblage, are to me the cause of some embarrassment [he began], for I look upon the situation in which I stand, to be one of extreme delicacy. I am the minister of a religion professed by a minority of our citizens; standing, by the permission of the pastor of a different communion, in accordance with the wish of some of my friends and their associates, members of the legislature of this nation, to address you upon the subject of religion. Whilst I know that I ought to speak freely, I also feel that I should avoid any unpleasant reference to those differences which exist between persons professing Christianity, except where the necessity of the case would demand such reference. And I am fully aware, that as I am the first clergyman of the Church to which I belong, who

[4] *The Substance of a Discourse preached in the Hall of the House of Representatives*, January 8, 1826. Baltimore, 1826. He wrote from Baltimore, on January 16, to a friend: "As I was obliged to leave Washington, I requested of a friend to procure for my inspection and correction, the copy made out from the notes of the gentleman who I was led to believe took them, but on Thursday I was informed that no notes had been taken. And as my delay in this city was to be very short, and my desire to comply with the request sincere, I lost no time in putting my recollections of what I had preached in writing. I believe the following pages will be found substantially correct; and this simple narrative will, I trust, plead my excuse for much defect of style, and want of decoration, as I was not able to wait to revise what I have thus sent to press more to gratify my friends than John, *Bishop of Charleston.*"

[5] *Works* (Messmer, vol. VII, pp. 9-44.

has had the honour of addressing you from this chair, it must be generally expected that I would rather speak upon some of the peculiarities of my own faith, than content myself with giving a discourse upon any general topic, that as being common to all, would be to you matter of no special interest.

The meaning of religion; man's duty to give worship to God; and the obligation of searching after God's truth, are the principal ideas of this excellent discourse. Reason and revelation and the truths brought to man's mind by their light are skilfully explained in order to lead to his first conclusion that all men are obliged to exert themselves for the discovery of truth. "Faith then is not folly, it is not abject slavery of the mind, it is not visionary fanaticism; it is not irrational assent to unintelligible propositions; but it is believing upon the testimony of God what human reason could not discover, but what a provident and wise Deity communicates for the information of our minds and the direction of our will."

In the multitude of truths which are known only to God and whose discovery is beyond the reach of our limited faculties, man must depend upon the light of God's revelation for their proper understanding:

> We are surrounded by mysteries of nature; we observe innumerable facts, not one of which has yet been explained, and many of which would be almost pronounced contradictions although known to be in coexistence; man is himself a mystery to man, yet the God who formed his body, and created his soul, plainly sees and distinctly understands all the minute details of the wonderful machine of his body; and is well acquainted with his vital principle; the nature and essence of the soul are within his view. He is lifted above the heavens; his days are from eternity to eternity; he pervades all space; his eye beholds the worlds which roll in the firmament, and embraces the infinite void; all things which exist are exposed to his vision; whilst man, the diminutive speck upon a spot of creation, scarcely distinguishes the objects which dimly show within his confined horizon: shall he presume to say that nothing exists beyond the narrow precincts of his temporary prison? Or, if the God of heaven declares some of the riches which lie scattered through his works: if he vouchsafes to inform us of his own nature, or of ours, that our relations may be more specifically understood; our hopes more clearly founded; our zeal better excited; our determinations better regulated; and our acts be more suitably, and simply, and satisfactorily directed, shall stunted little man

presume to say that perhaps he is deceived, because he has only the testimony of God, but not the testimony of his own reason? Does not his own reason tell him that God neither can be deceived, nor can he deceive his creatures? Thus his own reason informs man, that the testimony of God, making a revelation, is the very highest evidence of truth—the surest ground of certainty.

This is the place where we arrive at the essential distinction between the Roman Catholic Church and every other: it is, indeed, upon this question the whole difference turns; and to this it must be always brought back. The doctrine which, as a prelate of that church, and from my own conscientious conviction, I preach, differs very widely indeed from what is generally professed and acted upon by the great majority of our citizens, and by a vast portion of the respectable and enlightened assemblage which surrounds me. I shall state our doctrine fully upon this head; but I do not feel that it would be correct, or delicate on my part, to enter at present upon the field of polemics for its vindication. Still it will be permitted that I give an outline, imperfect and defective it must be, for the cause which I have assigned, of the reasons for that faith which is in us.

And here let me assure you, that if, in the course of my observations any expression should escape from me that may appear calculated to wound the feelings of those from whom I differ, that it is not my intention to assail, to insult, or to give pain; and that I may be pardoned for what will be in truth an inconsiderate expression, not intended to offend. Neither my own feelings, nor my judgment, nor my faith, would dictate to me anything calculated to embitter the feelings of those who differ from me merely for that difference. My kindest friends, my most intimate acquaintances, they whom I do, and ought to esteem and respect are at variance with my creed; yet it does not and ought not destroy our affection. In me it would be ingratitude; for I must avow, and I do it most willingly, that in my journeys through our states I have been frequently humbled and abashed at the kindness with which I have been treated. I came amongst you a stranger, and I went through your land with many and most serious and unfortunate mistakes, for which you were not blamable, operating to my disadvantage. If a Roman Catholic bishop were in truth what he is even now generally supposed to be, in various parts of this Union, he should not be permitted to reside amongst you; yet was I received into your houses, enrolled in your families, and profited by your kindness. I have

> frequently put the question to myself whether, if I had similar impressions regarding you, I could have acted with the like kindness; and I must own, I frequently doubted that I would. It is true, you laboured under serious mistakes as to what was my religion, and what were my duties and my obligations. But you were not yourselves the authors of those mistakes; nor had you within your reach the means of correcting them. I feel grateful to my friends who have afforded me this opportunity of perhaps aiding to do away with those impressions; for our affections will be more strong as those mistakes will be corrected; and it must gratify those, who, loving the country, behold us spread through it, to be assured, that we are not those vile beings that have been painted to their imaginations, and which ought not to be allowed existence in any civilized community.

The few Catholics among his auditors would be familiar with the logical sweep of his discourse from this standpoint of Catholic principles. The place Revelation holds in the expression of Catholic doctrine; the teaching of that doctrine for a long period before it was set down in writing by the Evangelists; the foundation of the Church as a society to carry on the work of Redemption, as a teaching tribunal which could not err in bringing the Gospel message to the hearts of men; the uncontradictory character of the truth taught; the actual writing of this revealed truth and the deductions which must be made from the fact that during the first century "no such book as we now receive, called the New Testament, was used or adopted in the Church as the mode for each individual of each church to ascertain what was the doctrine of Christ"; the actual writing of these doctrines and the authority that decided which of these compositions were inspired documents; and finally the necessity of an infallible voice of God on earth, namely, the Catholic Church: these questions form the body of the discourse which grows in vigor and eloquence as he proceeds.

The doctrine of papal infallibility in matters of faith and morals had not been defined at that time, and hence we do not find that dogma explicitly stated in Dr. England's address as a defined article of faith. "We do not profess", he says, "to believe our Pope infallible". This was not the first time Dr. England had so expressed his stand on a question which was to be discussed more fully during the generation after his death. In 1822, in a series

of papers on the *Pope's Dispensing Power*, he wrote: "The Roman Catholic Church does not teach that the Pope is infallible. . . . It is no article of the Catholic faith, that the Pope is infallible. It never was an article of the Roman Catholic faith, that the Pope is infallible." This is not, of course, a denial of the doctrine of infallibility. Dr. England had been taught by theologians who held that the testimony of the majority of the bishops, united in the head, the Pope, whether assembled or dispersed through their Sees, all over the world, could not err in defining the doctrines of Revelation. This infallible tribunal was not understood, he believed, by his hearers. Catholic belief in the infallible voice of the Church had given rise to much perplexity among non-Catholic Americans:

> A political difficulty has been sometimes raised here. If this infallible tribunal, which you profess yourselves bound to obey, should command you to overturn our government, and to tell you that it is the will of God to have it modelled anew, will you be bound to obey it? And how then can we consider those men to be good citizens, who profess to owe obedience to a foreign authority, to an authority not recognized in our constitution, to an authority which has excommunicated and deposed sovereigns, and which has absolved subjects and citizens from their bond of allegiance?
>
> Our answer to this is extremely simple and very plain; it is that we would not be bound to obey it, that we recognize no such authority. I would not allow to the Pope, or to any bishop of our church, outside this Union, the smallest interference with the humblest vote at our most insignificant balloting box. He has no right to such interference. You must, from the view which I have taken, see the plain distinction between spiritual authority and a right to interfere in the regulations of human government or civil concerns. You have in your constitution wisely kept them distinct and separate. It will be wisdom, and prudence, and safety to continue the separation. Your constitution says that Congress shall have no power to restrict the free exercise of religion. Suppose your dignified body tomorrow attempted to restrict me in the exercise of that right; though the law, as it would be called, should pass your two houses and obtain the signature of the president, I would not obey it, because it would be no law, it would be an usurpation; for you cannot make a law in violation of your constitution, you have no power in such a case. So, if that tribunal which is established by the Creator to testify to me what he has revealed, and

to make the necessary regulations of discipline for the government of the church, shall presume to go beyond that boundary which circumscribes its power, its acts are invalid; my rights are not to be destroyed by its usurpation; and there is no principle of my creed which prevents my using my natural right of proper resistance to any tyrannical usurpation. You have no power to interfere with my religious rights; the tribunal of the church has no power to interfere with my civil rights. It is a duty which every good man ought to discharge for his own, and for the public benefit, to resist any encroachment upon either. We do not believe that God gave to the church any power to interfere with our civil rights, or our civil concerns. Christ our Lord refused to interfere in the division of the inheritance between two brothers, one of whom requested that interference. The civil tribunals of Judea were vested with sufficient authority for that purpose, and he did not transfer it to his Apostles. It must hence be apparent, that any idea of the Roman Catholics of these republics being in any way under the influence of any foreign ecclesiastical power, or indeed of any church authority in the exercise of their civil rights, is a serious mistake. There is no class of our fellow-citizens more free to think and to act for themselves on the subject of our rights than we are; and I believe there is not any portion of the American family more jealous of foreign influence or more ready to resist it. We have brethren of our church in every part of the globe, under every form of government; this is a subject upon which each of us is free to act as he thinks proper. We know of no tribunal in our church which can interfere in our proceedings as citizens. Our ecclesiastical authority existed before our constitution, is not affected by it; there is not in the world a constitution which it does not precede, with which it could not coexist; it has seen nations perish, dynasties decay, empires prostrate; it has coexisted with all, it has survived them all, it is not dependent upon any one of them; they may still change, and it will still continue.

Among the current objections to Catholicism, Dr. England chooses as the most unsound the assertion that the Church is aristocratic, if not despotic, in its principles, and is not calculated for a Republic; that its spirit is opposed to that of republicanism. This was the most popular of all objections against Catholicism in the United States, and was to furnish the theme for the two great debates of the next decade between Hughes and Breckinridge (1833), and between Purcell and Campbell (1837).

If this antagonism exists between Catholicism and republicanism, then, Dr. England asks his auditors to explain the protection the Church has always thrown about the Republics of Italy, which he styles a soil fertile in republics, and most devoted to our religion:

> What was the religion of William Tell? He was a Roman Catholic. Look not only to the Swiss republics, but take San Marino,—this little state, during centuries, the most splendid specimen of the purest democracy, and this democracy protected by our Popes during these centuries. Men who make the assertions to which I have alluded cannot have read history! Amongst ourselves what is the religion of the venerable Charles Carroll of Carrollton? Men who make these assertions cannot have read our Declaration of Independence. What was the religion of the good, the estimable, the beloved Doctor Carroll, our first Archbishop of Baltimore, the founder of our hierarchy, the friend of Washington, the associate of Franklin? Have these men been degraded in our church because they aided in your struggle for the assertion of your rights, for the establishment of our glorious and our happy republics? No, they are the jewels which we prize, the ornaments of our church, the patriots of our country. They and others, whom we count as our members, and esteem for their virtues, have been the intimate and faithful associates of many of our best patriots who have passed from our transitory scene, and of some who yet view in consolation our prosperity. What is the religion of Simon Bolivar? What was the religion of the whole population of our republican sisters upon the southern continent? We are always assailed by speculation. We always answer by facts. Have we been found traitors in your councils, unfaithful to your trust, cowards in your fields, or in correspondence with your enemies? Yet we have been consulted for our prudence, confided in for our fidelity, enriched your soil with our blood, filled your decks with our energy; and though some of us might have wept at leaving the land of our ancestors because of the injustice of its rulers, we told our brothers who assailed you in the day of battle that we knew them not, and we adhered to those who gave us a place of refuge and impartial protection. Shall we then be told that our religion is not the religion calculated for republics, though it will be found that the vast majority of republican states and of republican patriots have been, and even now are Roman Catholics? It is true, ours is also the religion of a large portion of empires, and of kingdoms, and of principalities. The fact is so far an obvious reason, because it is the religion of the great bulk of the civilized world. Our tenets do not prescribe

any form of government which the people may properly and regularly establish. No revelation upon which my eye has fallen, or which ever reached my ear, has taught me that the Almighty God commanded us to be governed by kings, or by emperors, or by princes, or to associate in republics. Upon this God has left us free to make our own selection. The decision upon the question of expediency as to the form of government for temporal or civil concerns, is one to be settled by society, and not by the church. We therefore bind no nation or people to any special form, the form which they may adopt lies not with us, but with themselves. What suits the genius and circumstances of one people might be totally unfit for another; hence, no special form of human government for civil concerns has been generally established by divine authority; but the God of order who commands men to dwell together in peace, has armed the government which has been properly established by the principles of society, with power for the execution of the functions which are given by society to its administration; whilst it continues, within its due bounds, to discharge properly its constitutional obligations, it is the duty of each good member of society to concur in its support; and he who would resist its proper authority, would in this case resist the ordinance of the God of peace and of order, and, as the Apostle says, would purchase damnation for himself. This principle applies alike to all forms of government properly established, and properly administered, to republics and to kingdoms alike. It is then a mistake to imagine that our church has more congeniality to one species of civil government than to another; it has been fitted by its Author who saw the fluctuating state of civil rule, to exist independently of any, and to be suited to either. Its own peculiar forms for its internal regulation may and do continue to be adhered to under every form of temporal rule.

Another alleged tenet of the Catholic Faith which was current in the anti-Catholic press of the day was that the Church was a persecuting Church.

Is it not a tenet of our Church [Dr. England asks], that we must persecute all those who differ from us? Has not our religion been propagated by the firebrand and by the sword? Is not the Inquisition one of its component parts? Are not our boasted South American republics persecutors still? And in the code of our infallible church have we not canons of persecution which we are conscientiously bound to obey and to enforce? Did not the great Lateran Council, in 1215, command

all princes to exterminate all heretics? If then, we are not persecutors in fact, it is because we want the power, for it is plain that we do not want the disposition.

Not one of these questions could be truly answered in the affirmative, Dr. England asserts, for the spirit of religion is that of peace and of mercy, not that of persecution:

I know of no power given by God to any man, or to any body of men, in the Christian dispensation, to inflict any penalty of a temporal description upon their fellow-men for mere religious error. If such error shall cause the violation of peace, or shall interfere with the well-being of society, temporal governments, being established to prevent such disorders, have their own inherent right, but not a religious commission, to interfere merely for that prevention. Each individual is responsible to God for his conduct in this regard; to Him and to Him only, we stand or fall. He commissioned the Church to teach his doctrine, but he did not commission her to persecute those who would not receive it. He who beholds the evidence of truth and will not follow it is inexcusable; he who having used his best exertions for that purpose, and having with the best intentions made a mistake in coming to his conclusion, is not a criminal because of that mistake. God alone, the searcher of our hearts, can clearly see the full accountability of each individual upon this head, because each person must be accountable according to his opportunities. I feel that many and serious mistakes are made by my friends in this country. I know who are mistaken, but far be it from me to say that all who err are criminal. I have frequently asked myself whether, if I had only the same opportunities of knowing the doctrine of my church, and evidences, that many of them have had I would be what I now am. Indeed it would be very extraordinary if I was. They labour under those mistakes, not through their own fault in several instances; and if the Roman Catholic Church were, in her doctrine and her practices, what they have been taught she is, I would not be a Roman Catholic. They imagine her to be what she is not; and when they oppose what they believe her to be, it is not to her their opposition is really given. To God, and to Him alone, belongs ultimately to discriminate between those who are criminal and those who are innocent in their error; and I look in vain through every record, in vain I listen to every testimony of my doctrine to discover any command to persecute, any power to inflict fine, or disqualification, or bodily chastisement upon those who are in mere religious error. It is no doctrine of any church calling itself Christian; but, unfortunately,

I know it has been practiced by some Roman Catholics, and it has been practiced in every church which accused her of having had recourse thereto. I would say then it was taught by no church; it has been practiced in all. One great temptation to its exercise, is the union of any church with state; and religion has more frequently been but a pretext with statesmen for a political purpose than the cause of persecution for zeal on its own behalf.

A thorough examination of the canons on heresy promulgated by the Council of Lateran (1215) follows this statement of the general principle of the Church towards other faiths. The next question treated is that of the origin and the extent of papal power in deposing sovereigns or in absolving their subjects from oaths of allegiance to their rulers. He answers as follows:

To judge properly of facts we must know their special circumstances, not their mere outline. The circumstances of Christendom were then widely different from those in which we are now placed. Europe was then under the feudal system. I have seldom found a writer, not a Catholic, who, in treating of that age and that system, has been accurate, and who has not done us very serious injustice. But a friend of mine, who is a respectable member of your honourable body, has led me to read Hallam's account of it, and I must say that I have seldom met with so much candour, and, what I call, so much truth. From reading his statement of that system it will be plainly seen that there existed amongst the Christian potentates a sort of federation, in which they bound themselves by certain regulations and to the observance of those they were held not merely by their oaths, but by various penalties; sometimes they consented that the penalty should be the loss of their station. It was of course necessary to ascertain that the fact existed before its consequences should be declared to follow; it was also necessary to establish some tribunal to examine and to decide as to the existence of the fact itself, and to proclaim that existence. Amongst independent sovereigns there was no superior, and it was natural to fear that mutual jealousy would create great difficulty in selecting a chief; and that what originated in concession might afterwards be claimed as a right. They were however all members of one church, of which the Pope was the head, and, in this respect, their common father; and by universal consent it was regulated that he should examine, ascertain the fact, proclaim it, and declare its consequences. Thus he did in reality possess the power of deposing monarchs, and of absolving their subjects from oaths of fealty, but only those monarchs who were

members of that federation, and in the cases legally provided for, and by their concession, both by divine right, and during the term of that federation and the existence of his commission. He governed the church by divine right, he deposed kings and absolved subjects from their allegiance by human concession. I preach the doctrines of my church by divine right, but I preach from this spot not by that right but by permission of others.

Dr. England then deals thoroughly with the charge that it is a doctrine of the Catholic Church that the Pope has been divinely commissioned to depose kings and to interfere with republics, by absolving the subjects of the former from their allegiance, or by interfering with the civil concerns of the latter:

When the persecuted English Catholics, under Elizabeth, found the Pope making an unfounded claim to this right, and upon the shadow of that unfounded right making inroads upon their national independence, by declaring who should or who should not be their temporal ruler, they well showed how little they regarded his absolving them from their allegiance, for they volunteered their services to protect their liberties, which their Catholic ancestors had laboured to establish. And she well found that a Catholic might safely be entrusted with the admiralty of her fleet, and that her person was secure amongst her disgraced Catholic nobility and gentry, and their persecuted adherents; although the Court of Rome had issued its bull of absolution, and some divines were found who endeavoured to prove that what originated in voluntary concession of states and monarchs was derived from divine institution. If then Elizabeth, of whose character I would not wish in this place to express my opinion, was safe amidst those whom she persecuted for the faith, even when the head of their church absolved them from allegiance, and if at such a moment they flocked round her standard to repel Catholic invaders who came with consecrated banners, and that it is admitted on all hands that in so doing they violated no principle of doctrine or of discipline of their church, as we all avow, surely America need not fear for the fidelity of her Catholic citizens, whom she cherishes and whom she receives to her bosom with affection and shelters from the persecution of others. Neither will any person attempt to establish an analogy between our federation and that of feudalism, to argue that the Pope can do amongst us what he did amongst European potentates under circumstances widely different.

It had been frequently objected in the American press that the Catholic Church had more extensively persecuted non-Catholics than any other. "This is not the place" he replied, "to enter into a comparison of atrocities: but I will assert, that when weighed against each other, our scale will be found light indeed. Did any person think proper to conjure up the victims from the grave, I would engage to produce evidence of the inflictions upon us in abundance, until the hairs of our hearers should stand on end, and humanity interpose to prevent the recital. But the crimes of individuals or of assemblies are not the doctrines of a church."

The conclusion which follows is an exhortation upon the two commandments of Christ, that we should love God with our whole heart, our whole soul and whole mind, and with all our strength, and our neighbor as ourself for the sake of God:

> Nothing can excuse us from the discharge of this duty, the observance of this great commandment. No difference of creed or of religion, can form a pretext for non-compliance. Religion, that holy name has too often been abused for this end, that man might flatter himself with having the sanction of heaven for the indulgence of a bad passion.—In these happy and free states we stand upon the equal ground of religious right; we may freely love and bear with each other, and exhibit to Europe a contrast to her jealousies in our affection. By inquiry we shall correct many mistakes, by which our feelings have been embittered; we shall be more bound together in amity, as we become more intimate; and may our harmony and union here below produce that peace and good will that may be emblematic of our enjoyment of more lasting happiness in a better world.

It is evident from the interest created by the press notices of Bishop England's address before Congress, that the whole of his discourse was carefully scrutinized by all whose patriotism had been aroused by the argument that the Catholic religion was detrimental to the progress of republican ideals. Misrepresentations of the Catholic religion were being industriously propagated in England and in America, especially through the attack made by the renegade priest, Blanco White. In May, 1826, the Catholic bishops of England felt obliged to present to the public a concise statement of Catholic belief. "They had flattered themselves", the statement runs, "that the numerous and uniform exposition of their religious doctrines, given in public professions of the Catholic faith, in Cath-

olic Catechisms, in various authentic documents, and in declarations confirmed by their solemn oaths, would have abundantly sufficed to correct all misrepresentations of their real tenets."[6] The same attitude of mind was visible in the United States at this period. The charge of a double allegiance which limited Catholic loyalty to the government formed the basis of every issue of the numerous journals emanating from the non-Catholic press. Blanco White's *Practical and Internal Evidence against Catholicism* was issued in an American reprint, in 1826, at Georgetown, District of Columbia, and the book was recommended as "a temperate and able exposition of the errors of Popery" by a group of thirty-two Protestant ministers, who, headed by Bishop James Kemp, signed their names to the public advertisement of the volume. "B. C.", who is John, Bishop of Charleston, answered Blanco White's book in detail in the *Catholic Miscellany* for 1826 and 1827, and others issued denials of the charges in White's volume. But, apparently, the storm which these Protestant religious journals were endeavoring to arouse in the country was not to be allayed by even such an honest and eloquent exposition of Catholic doctrine as that given by Dr. England in the House of Representatives. One factor in the coming conflict was undeniable: the official manifestation of the American Protestant attitude towards the increasing power of Catholicism in the country was not met officially by the leaders of the Church here. It was not supineness, nor was it spiritual lethargy, but inability on the part of Archbishop Maréchal and the hierarchy to understand that the attack upon the Church was the most serious and best organized of any since the early days of the Protestant Revolt. That the exclusion of Catholics from a voice in national and civil affairs, to which the whole movement was to tend until the decade prior to the Civil War, was not wholly successful, is not due to the first generation of our bishops, who thought it best to allow individual scholars, like Dr. England, to attract to themselves the brunt of the Protestant-Catholic quarrel of these decades. In one of his later letters, Dr. England wrote an epitaph for the period: "Fighting in Detached Squads."

There is nothing in Maréchal's letter of January 10, 1826, to the

---

[6] *Address to the Flocks of the Reverend Approvers of Blanco White's Internal Evidences against Catholicism.* Pp. 48. London, 1826.

Sacred Congregation which chronicles for the Holy See the unique scene of a Catholic bishop standing before the legislators of the nation, explaining in terse and eloquent terms those very doctrines which many of his hearers at heart abhorred or feared.[7] It may be that in his letter to Samuel Eccleston, then a student at Issy, Paris, dated February 12, 1826, he had Bishop England's successful venture in mind, when he advises the young cleric to return with two gifts, first, a thorough penetration of the spirit of Saint Sulpice, which Maréchal praises as "*infiniment préférable à toutes les connaissances que vous pourrez acquérir durant votre sejour en Europe*"; and secondly, pulpit eloquence "*le grand objet que le bien de la Religion dans ce pays demande que vous ayiez, principalement sous les yeux, c'est l'eloquence sacrée*". In fact, the Archbishop proposed to Eccleston that on his return he should form a Missionary Band of eloquent priests for the purpose of giving sermons in all parts of the diocese.[8]

Among Bishop England's private papers in the Charleston Diocesan Archives is the certificate of his citizenship, dated one month after the address before Congress, February 6, 1826.

---

[7]BCA—Case 22B—W 4.
[8]BCA—Case 21—N 2.

CHAPTER XXI

Antecedents to the First Provincial Council (1821-1828)

It is difficult to say what influence finally prevailed over the reluctance of Archbishop Whitfield to consent to the First Provincial Council of Baltimore. That Archbishop Maréchal had set his face against any meeting of his suffragans is not a thesis needing exceptional historical proof. Shea has tried to control the truth by giving us what today is the current Catholic tradition; namely, that "the Metropolitan evidently considered it more prudent to wait until Bishops Conwell, England and Kelly should acquire some personal knowledge of the actual condition of their dioceses, and of the rules of discipline to be adopted which could be practically enforced in the country."[1] Bishop England had organized his own diocese upon a permanently practical basis by the end of the year 1822. Bishop Kelly had departed for Ireland in June, 1822. By this same date. the Archbishop could not have seriously expected anything but continued and growing disorder in Philadelphia under its ill-fated bishop. The reason lies deeper than Shea's explanation.

When the Meeting of the Hierarchy ended on November 5, 1810, it was decided with Archbishop Carroll's consent that the bishops should be convened again in 1812. The traditional reasons given for the indefinite postponement of what should have been the First Provincial Council are the War of 1812 and the captivity of Pius VII. To accept either of these facts as physically or canonically

---

[1]Shea (*op. cit.*, vol. III, p. 408) claims that Maréchal "was fully alive to the importance of holding a Provincial Council, and as early as 1823, Pope Pius VII addressed a brief to him (*Non sine magno*, August 24, 1823) in regard to the convocation of such a synod in the United States." Shea says that papal approval was given by the brief *Quo longius* of August 16, 1828. This latter document deals solely with the schism at New Orleans and is addressed to Bishop Rosati. There is no other brief of this date. The *Non sine magno* of Pius VII is dated August 24, 1822, and is the papal condemnation of Hogan. It contains nothing regarding the proposed Council. The fact that Hogan had appealed from his own bishop (Conwell) to a Council of the bishops would have precluded the convocation at that time. (A printed copy of the 1822 brief is in the BCA—Case 17—J13.)

preventing the Council is to misunderstand both. It was evident by all that, once the war did break out, it would be fought along the Canadian border.

There had been too much open talk in Congress on the conquest of Canada for any one to doubt the actuating cause in the minds of the war-hawks of 1812. The capture of Detroit in August, 1812, was indeed a serious blow to the American plan of invasion. The country rang with the scandalous cowardice and inefficiency of all concerned in the war from the Secretaries of War and of the Navy to the commanders in charge of the American forces. The following year the scene of conflict shifted to the western and northwestern frontier and became more a campaign against the Indians than a war with English colonials. The capture and burning of Washington, preceded by a disgraceful rout of American soldiers in August, 1814, occurred about the same time the American envoys were waiting at Ghent for the arrival of the British commissioners who were to arrange the terms of peace between Great Britain and the United States. One of the American secretaries, young Henry Carroll, a relation of Archbishop Carroll, reached New York on February 11, 1815, with the Ghent treaty of peace. The treaty was as ineffectual as the campaigns of the war. It is true that the war reached Baltimore, but not until September, 1814.

In none of the correspondence during these years (1812-1815) do we find any serious consideration of the proposed Council. In June, 1812, Archbishop Carroll sent out word that the Council would convene on November 1, 1812. Cheverus who had no intention of making the long and uncomfortable journey by stage-coach from Boston to Baltimore, wrote that he saw no occasion for the Council.[2] Flaget started shortly after he received the summons (August, 1812) and reached Baltimore early in October of that year, only to learn that on September 16, 1812, Father Tessier had sent out letters to the suffragans in Carroll's name, stating that the Council had been postponed indefinitely. Flaget remained in Baltimore until April, 1813, not without hopes that Cheverus would come to the metropolitan city, but the Bishop of Boston saw no reason for a Council to settle questions which "the professors of the seminary could just as

[2]Guilday, *Carroll,* p. 816.

easily decide".[3] The war had little if anything to do with the lack of interest shown by Cheverus and Egan. The imprisonment of Pius VII was a more serious matter, since by Canon Law the Holy See alone can authorize the holding of a Provincial Council, the acts of which remain without juridic force until approved by the Pope. But in the extraordinary condition of things, the ever-growing necessity at home of establishing order in the American Church and the continued imprisonment of the Holy Father, a Council could have been held; and while awaiting approbation for its acts and decrees, the disciplinary legislation so badly needed in the country might have been made the subject of diocesan regulation. Viewed in the light of the next decade (1812-1822), the postponement of the Council was a calamity to the Church in this country. Carroll's last year of life was not favorable to the holding of a Council, and the disorder which took such sturdy hold on the Church in several of the principal Catholic centers during Archbishop Neale's regime (1815-1817) seemed to make such an episcopal meeting rather a danger than a blessing.

Maréchal had no intention of holding a Council, if such could be avoided. He was the Metropolitan of the Church for two years before the establishment of the See of Charleston (1820), but his correspondence shows nowhere any serious attitude towards the formation of national discipline. Evidently, Maréchal believed that a reprint of the Acts of the Synod of 1791, together with the Regulations of 1810, and some regulations of his own, in pamphlet form in 1818, was all that would be needed to bring harmony to Church discipline.[4] Maréchal's description of the problems affecting the peace of the Church here (October 16, 1818) loses no opportunity of giving causes and effects of the same in detail; but there is no mention of any desire for national discipline to curb the growing evils. Neither the Philadelphia and New York turmoils, nor those which paralyzed spiritual effort in the Southland, aroused Maréchal's suspicions that probably the regulations laid down by the Council of Trent for diocesan synods and national councils might bring

[3] Spalding, *Flaget*, pp. 112, 156.

[4] A copy of this rare pamphlet is in the library of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia. The Sacred Congregation practically asked for its suppression, since the Archbishop had gone beyond his metropolitan rights in legislating for the dioceses of the province.

peace to the Church in America. Maréchal intended to rule the Church here single-handed.

John England may not have been cognizant of the annoyance he caused in practically every letter he wrote to Maréchal from the beginning of 1821 down to the latter's death in 1828, by his insistence upon the necessity of a National Synod of the American hierarchy.

John England's life as a bishop (1820-1842) extended over a period of years which saw at its beginning the spirit of America aroused as never before to a tense determination to travel its way alone, unhampered further by foreign influences—*novus sæculorum nascitur ordo*—and witnessed at its close the preparations for the inevitable conquest of the West and Southwest from foreign domination.[5]

The twenty-two years of his episcopate can be justly summed up as an heroic and to some extent a successful effort to overcome Protestant American prejudice towards the Catholic Church, and to lessen the fears of non-Catholic leaders who were hesitating over the growth of Catholicism in the land during this same period. But there was a danger which was fully recognized by leaders in the Church here, and John England can easily be given the first place in the group. That danger lay within the Catholic Church itself. Even non-Catholics realized that the attacks upon the Church, whether by the pen or by violence, reacted upon the social conditions of the time to the detriment of the assailants themselves. They recognized the error of accusing Catholics of disloyalty, when the facts were disproving this charge at every angle of the situation. But what was feared, namely, foreign spiritual interference in American temporal affairs, or foreign temporal interference in American spiritual affairs, was one way of stating their attitude upon a very grave problem, the Americanization of the alien Catholics who came in such numbers after the War of 1812. Census statistics are generally misleading, but they are clear in this, that up to the war with Mexico the vast majority of the newcomers were Catholics from Ireland.

No prelate of the Catholic Church in the United States, prior to

---

[5]Turner, *Rise of the New West*, p. 222. New York, 1906; E. E. Robinson, *The Evolution of American Political Parties*. New York, 1924.

the Civil War, saw more clearly than John England the vital necessity for the Americanization of its people. When he arrived here in 1820, he found the Catholic Church a foreign Church, ruled for the most part by prelates whose training and outlook were French. If he was, even unconsciously, influenced by the belief that the French never would or could amalgamate with the Anglo-Saxon social and political evolution of the American nation, and that the Irish newcomer, an American the moment he left Ireland, was more easily adaptable to our customs, he may be pardoned in view of the facts with which he became so keenly and painfully intimate during his episcopate. A Home Ruler at heart, John England believed that the progress of the Catholic Church in the United States depended upon its swift acclimatization with American ways. Sixty years after his death, another American bishop, not having been born in Ireland, viewed Dr. England's activity in this respect as a species of Gallicanism.[6]

Dr. England was not a nationalist in the opprobrious theological sense sometimes placed upon that word. No prelate was more obedient to the Holy See. For five years he suffered in silence Cardinal Fontana's unjust rebuke on his attempt to bring peace to the American Church and to put an end to the scandal which Catholics in New York, Philadelphia, and elsewhere, had given to God-fearing Christians of other faiths. For seven years he was the victim of Archbishop Maréchal's arbitrary method of ruling the Church in the United States. To John England, the American, there was no other outcome but disorder in the Catholic ranks, so long as a group of ecclesiastics, who remained foreign, influenced Church polity. To John England, the bishop, Maréchal's episcopate was a misfortune for the American Church.

The beginning of the New Year of 1822 found the Church in the United States in an unenviable situation. The six years which had elapsed since Archbishop Carroll's death (December 3, 1815), constituted, as we now look back upon them, a period equally divided between progress and disorder. The causes of these disorders have been sketched in previous chapters. There is the basis for a sum-

[6]Cf. Gabriels, *Le Catholicisme aux États-Unis etc.*, in the *Correspondant* for October, 1901.

mary of Church conditions at the time in the *Laity's Directory*, which appeared at the beginning of the year 1822:[7]

> In looking back to the period of the first introduction of catholicity into this country, under Lord Baltimore in the settlement of Maryland, and contrasting the state of the Church then, with what it now is, the handful of individuals then composing the flock of Jesus Christ, confined to a small province, with the immense numbers now spread over every part of this union, we are at once struck at the astonishing rapidity of the increase; we cannot but see in it the protecting hand of the Almighty, who has been pleased to bless in so extraordinary a manner the labours of his servants; and from the judicious arrangements, combined with other operating causes made by the Holy See for establishing new diocesses in the different states, in proportion to the diffusion of catholicity among them, we are led to hope for a still more abundant harvest, a still greater increase of faithful: and that *the Lord* will continue *to add daily to his society such as shall be saved.*[8]

The information given in this rare little book is accurate but incomplete. There is in the Propaganda Archives a contemporary *General Description of the Metropolitan Province of Baltimore in the United States of America.*[9] The number of dioceses is eight, Louisiana (New Orleans) not being given, because it was not a part of the Province at that time. The number of bishops, counting Du Bourg, was ten, the Diocese of Bardstown having a coadjutor in the person of Bishop David. The number of priests was one hundred and seventeen: eighty-three seculars and thirty-four religious. There were one hundred churches distributed geographically as follows: Baltimore, 52; Boston, 3; New York, 4; Philadelphia, 11; Richmond, 2; Kentucky, 15; Charleston, 3; Cincinnati, no figures given. The number of Catholics was 163,000. Fifteen educational

---

[7]This unique publication made its bow to the Catholic public with a *New Year's Gift for the Year 1822*, in the shape of a sermon given in London in 1786, by Rev. Walter Blake Kirwin. The editor of the *Laity's Directory* avers that the sermon is an excellent one, even though Kirwin became an apostate in 1787, and that it was "presented to the Catholics of the United States, in the hope that it will be found equally interesting and instructive to them."

[8]P. 79.

[9]Prop. Arch., *Scritt. refer., Amer. Cent.*, vol. 4, fol. 457. The tableau is printed in Hughes, *op. cit., Doc.*, vol. I, pt. II, p. 959. It was probably written by Maréchal in preparation for his journey to Rome in October, 1821. In the *Lettere*, vol. 303, fol. 128 (Feb. 28, 1822), there is a letter from Propaganda to Maréchal thanking him for a "geographical" map of the United States.

institutions are listed, and the number of scholars (boys, girls, and seminarians) is given as about four hundred. The total number of nuns in the Province was 208. Under the heading: "Present Condition of Religion" the following captions are set down:

Baltimore: *Peace and great prosperity.*
Boston: *Everything prospering.*
New York: *Grave disorders.*
Philadelphia: *Complete confusion.*
Richmond: *Confusion.*
Bardstown: *Peace and religious growth.*
Charleston: *Peace and Hopes for future Prosperity.*
Cincinnati: *Situation unknown.*

Judging by this tableau, it is evident that the writer conveys the idea that in the dioceses ruled by Irish bishops, all was confusion, dissension and disorder, while peace and prosperity reigned under the French bishops. Charleston was added to the latter category, because the peace existing there could be claimed by Maréchal as the work of his vicar-general, Father Benedict Fenwick, S. J., before Dr. England's coming. The dissensions in New York, Philadelphia, and Virginia were serious but they were adjustable; as Dr. Engand had proved in a short time after taking possession of his See. Beneath the alleged peace of Baltimore lay a graver danger than trusteeism: the relations of the metropolitan with the American episcopate in the problem of nominations to vacant Sees.

All was not well with the Church in the fifteen years immediately following Carroll's death. Before John Carroll's appointment, the American Church barely escaped tutelage to the hierarchy of France. During Carroll's episcopate (1790-1815), the readjustment necessary to bring the Church into direct contact with the center of canonical discipline was being gradually made; and, to Rome's credit be it said, it was made with concessions to the infant Church here which were in themselves extraordinary. During Neale's short episcopate, this adjustment was retarded by Propaganda's policy of conciliation with recalcitrant clergy and laity. When Maréchal became Archbishop of Baltimore (1817), stern measures were needed to curb the growing unrest and to bring harmony into the American Church. Maréchal, however, signalized his succession to the See of Baltimore by an attack upon the Irish clergy. During the ten years of his episcopate, the two racial elements stood apart through a self-

assertiveness which did not benefit the Church and which hindered participation in the work of nationalizing the Catholic newcomers. Maréchal's death did not end the opposition to the method decreed by the Council of Trent for the canonical basis of Church discipline in any country. Forces, which his successor could not control, made further delay dangerous. The continuance of Maréchal's policy by Archbishop Whitfield would have rendered the situation so serious that the prelates were at last aroused to the grave necessity of bringing peace to the distracted American Church. Whitfield was practically forced to call the Council; and he as well as the other bishops realized that back of the Holy See's insistence on a National Synod stood the energetic Bishop of Charleston. If anything were needed to overcome Whitfield's opposition, it was the fact that, during Maréchal's time, the Church here had undergone the unusual experience of two appeals from the decision of the Holy See to the Government of the United States.

John England's earliest indication to Archbishop Maréchal that the Church in the United States needed uniform disciplinary regulation for the good of both clergy and laity, found that prelate in the singular position of having been appealed to as the canonical head of the American Church by Hogan of Philadelphia against the suspension inflicted upon him by Bishop Conwell,[10] and by Father William Taylor against Bishop Connolly for a like punishment, both these priests calling upon him as Metropolitan to interfere and to consider their letters as formal appeals from the sentence of their Ordinaries.[11]

Maréchal's policy was one of neutrality in all contentions outside his own diocese and one of interested interference in filling the Sees that became vacant. Maréchal declined both appeals. Hogan's answer is significant:

> I have seen a letter handed about this City which Dr. Conwell says is a copy of one you sent to me, asserting your reasons for not attending to my *new appeal.* I can not believe it is your letter. I have too high a respect for your Lordship to suppose, for an instant, that you could be the author of so scurrilous a production. However, as Dr. Conwell says it is your letter, I must believe him, until your Lordship denies it. I

[10]BCA—Case 17—J12: Hogan to Maréchal, Jan. 16, 1821.
[11]BCA—Case 20—S11: Taylor to Maréchal, Feb. 2, 1821.

should thank your Lordship to let me know, by return of post, whether it is your letter or not, as I am determined to publish it in my next pamphlet with the necessary comments on its *contents and style.* I beg to assure your Lordship that I have never read an answer to either of my appeals to you as Metropolitan; my first appeal was dated the 14th of December, & between it and January 2d, there elapsed a space of about two weeks, which term, notwithstanding your well known prudence & well directed caution on ecclesiastical affairs, I conceived sufficient for your Lordship to determine on the course you should pursue with regard to our differences in this City, particularly as I am well aware, your Lordship would prefer sacrificing any personal happiness & suffer any personal inconvenience rather than see the Church of God disturbed for an instant through any neglect on your part. I have the honour to be your Lordship's humble servant,

WILLIAM HOGAN.

February 6th, 1821.

P. S. I shall send by this post a pamphlet to your Lordship in which I take the liberty of pointing out what the duty of the Metropolitan is & I shall dwell more on this important subject in my next.[12]

On the back of this letter Maréchal has written: "inquires about authenticity of my letter—a liar and hypocrite."

The first of Dr. England's appeals to the Archbishop to call the bishops of the country together is dated Charleston, March 1, 1821:

My Lord,

I take the earliest opportunity after my return to this city of thanking your Grace for your kind letter, which I received in Savannah, being then in the visitation of the southeastern portion of my Diocess. I proceeded thence to Augusta and the borders of Warren and Wilkes Counties in Georgia and having stopped for a week in Augusta on my return, I visited Columbia, the capital of this state and thence returned hither where Mr. Fenwick had nearly 150 persons prepared for Confirmation. I had nearly the same number to confirm in the other places, besides many more at Confession and Communion, and crowds, particularly of our separated brethren, at my sermons, in which I found I could without offence speak with the utmost freedom of the Marks of the true Church and show that they were only to be found amongst us. I had the gratification of being waited upon by many persons of considerable rank and talent to say

[12]BCA—Case 17—J13.

that their prejudices had been removed and that they would reflect on what I had said. I have also written and had the most gratifying answers from the Catholics of many places who offer to build Churches and are anxious for Clergymen.

I should think from what I see, that if I had five or six good priests who could preach well in English, I could immediately employ them. I have already notified that I will not permit a Church to be erected unless the property be vested in Trustees for *me* and *not for the Congregation;* the principle is generally acceded to. And even the Trustees of the Church here have already told me that provided I will make their Church the Cathedral they will apply to the legislature for an act to divest themselves of the property and vest it in me. I have not yet determined whether it is better for me to come into this arrangement or to build a new Church; the last would be better, but the obstacles are great and many. However God will I trust direct me to the best. With His help I hope to be of some use here. But, my Lord, all my efforts will be cramped, and my plan unexecuted and thwarted unless the Rev. Mr. Fenwick be allowed to assist me for some time. He sees my situation. He knows my plans, he has zeal and good sense and let it be left to his own conscience to say whether he does not think, nay, whether he is not convinced, that his removal would throw back Religion twenty years from the progress it is likely to make. All I ask is that he may be left to judge for himself, others can not judge. For God's sake, then, let me not be ruined by his departure. I do not ask to avoid labour, but I ask to enable me to labour. If he goes I am shut up a prisoner in this city and my Diocess is overspread with error without my being able to shed one ray of light upon those whom I am bound to instruct. But if Mr. F. be here, I am at liberty to go through my Diocess, instruct my people, organize my Congregations, establish funds for Churches, and know how to send my instruction into every village under my care. Neither you nor his Superior can be such enemies to this unfortunate Diocess as to prevent me from doing this. Let him at least have leave for the stay of one year provided he himself think it will promote the glory of God. Then I shall be content to lose him if I must.

Do not deem it arrogance in me, the youngest in every way amongst the Bishops of this Union, that I suggest to your Grace the propriety of assembling us at some early period for the purpose of having established some uniform system of Discipline for our Churches, and of having common counsel and advice upon a variety of important topics regarding the causes and remedies of those disastrous contests which have torn and do

still agitate this afflicted Church. I am certain your Grace must feel convinced of its necessity, and I should hope our Brethren would feel happy in complying with your Grace's wishes in this respect.

I remain My Lord, with respect and affection,

Your Grace's Most Obedient Servant in Jesus Christ,

✠JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*[13]

Dr. England's first long Report to Cardinal Fontana (April 4, 1821) contains a detailed account of his experience during the Visitation of his diocese, with a passing reference to the dissensions in Philadelphia and New York. He had not yet recovered, he writes, from his astonishment over Maréchal's stand against a Council, and therefore avoided insisting upon a Provincial Synod. Propaganda had reached a decision about this time on a proposition made to the Holy See by Maréchal, namely, the erection of a Chapter for the metropolitan church in Baltimore. The Archbishop had asked for permission to erect a Chapter of eight or ten priests, who would have all the rights and privileges of cathedral canons, but would not be held to the obligation of the office in choir. The purpose he had in view was that he would be guided by this body, which would elect a Vicar-Capitular, who could *sede vacante* administer the archdiocese. Propaganda replied (May, 1821) that the kind of Chapter asked for by the Archbishop was unknown to Canon Law and that such a Chapter could only be erected by a special permission of the Holy See. The Cardinals of Propaganda however did not see the expediency of such a body. Maréchal was free to appoint Consultors, but it would violate the rights of the rest of the clergy of the United States, should a small group have the privilege of electing a Vicar-Capitular out of their ranks. A second request was also refused; namely, that European priests coming to America with dimissorial letters be obliged to stay even against their will in the diocese where they had been accepted.[14]

---

[13]BCA—Case 16—J5.

[14]Prop. Arch., *Lettere,* vol. 302, fol. 190. Bishop Poynter of London writes (July 30, 1821): "I also send a letter from Dr. Gradwell, which came to London a few days too late for the last mail. Your Grace will see how active that Gentleman is in your cause. He has taken it quite to heart. I have endeavored to support your cause with Card. Fontana by the strongest arguments & observations that I could propose. I see that those Roman Canonists are too much attached to certain *accidental* formalities, to know how to make allowances for Countries where the Catholic Religion is not publicly adopted

On July 21, 1821, Dr. England, writing from Raleigh, North Carolina, to the Archbishop about the *Missal* he was publishing, says: "I cannot close without again stating the conviction that a Synod in which we might all encourage each other and fix upon some common rule of conduct would do great good."

In replying to this letter, Archbishop Maréchal wrote (July 28): "As to holding a Provincial Council, I still do not see any sufficient reason to convoke one. It would not be attended by several of my suffragants who are of my opinion, and truly what would be the matter which would be proposed to its decision, not certainly mere points of discipline." Maréchal believed that "articles of discipline can with difficulty be made that suit so immense a territory: a regulation excellent for your diocese would not answer that of Boston, and one useful in Kentucky would be impracticable in New York or Philadelphia. The only important point which could be discussed is the scandals of Philadelphia. But any decree framed by us would be treated by Hogan and his party with the same brutal impiety with which they treated our individual condemnation of his conduct."[15]

Had Dr. England been aware of what was going on behind the scenes, he would, no doubt, in spite of his youth and recent coming to the United States, have pressed the necessity of a National Synod with more vigor.

There is no apparent connection between Maréchal's request for a Cathedral Chapter and another request which was made by the Baltimore Metropolitan indirectly through Bishop Plessis of Quebec, who then approached Propaganda indirectly through Bishop Poynter, Vicar-Apostolic of the London District. This request concerned the method of filling vacant Sees in the American Church.[16]

---

in all its external forms. I have made some strong observations to them on this subject & have urged the propriety & advantage of your having a Chapter, which will add dignity to your clergy & be a great support to your Grace's authority. I cited the example of our English secular Chapter which was instituted by Doctor Bishop in 1623, tho he had no *material* cathedral, or *stalls* for his Canons, etc., but which was acknowledged as a true Chapter. I have not heard yet from Mr. Gradwell concerning the success of my arguments with the Roman Canonists. I can only say that I have pleaded the cause of your Grace, as if it had been my own."

[15]BCA—Case 16—J7. Maréchal's reply is in the Catholic Archives of America (Notre Dame).

[16]An unedited letter from Propaganda to Plessis (*Lettere*, vol. 303, fol. 516) gives us some details of Maréchal's request. The Archbishop was dissatisfied with Propaganda's method of electing to American Sees, without consulting

The appointments to Philadelphia, Richmond, and Charleston were not only displeasing to the Baltimore Metropolitan, but they indicated influences at work which were undermining the autonomy Maréchal believed necessary for progress in the Church here. The years 1820-1822 saw the French ascendancy in jeopardy. Maréchal's plan included the suppression of the Virginia See, strict aloofness from the growing disorders in Philadelphia, and the elimination of John England from influencing national Catholic affairs. In all three Dr. Maréchal was successful.

To avoid a repetition of the arbitrary methods used by Propaganda in appointments to vacant Sees, Maréchal decided that personal representation needed to be made at Rome itself. At first, Maréchal tried to induce Bishop Cheverus to accept this important mission, but there were reasons why the Bishop of Boston considered such an interest in American affairs detrimental to his own future. Maréchal then decided to go himself, and to go as secretly as possible. He had laid his plans well. Dr. Gradwell had been secured at a cost of thirty louis a year—"half of my little revenue"—to act as his agent at Rome.[17] A few days before leaving Baltimore, he wrote to Bishop Plessis of Quebec (October 9, 1821):

---

the Metropolitan of Baltimore and his suffragans: "*Versabatur primum in episcoporum delectu, te (Plessis) referente, archiepiscopum illum valde dolere, quod Sacra Congregatio in eligendis foederatarum illarum provinciarum episcopis uniuscujusque relationibus atque officiis aures praebent, quando metropolitae munus esse deberet sententiam exquirere ceterorum antistitum, eumque Sacræ Congregationi praesentare, qui communi illorum judicio dignior reputatur, ita ut Sacra Congregatio ab eo recedere non debere, qui a metropolita proponitur.*" Plessis was informed a bit sharply by the Cardinals that such a right was not inherent in the office of metropolitan, according to either the ancient or modern Canon Law. The appointment of bishops to sees in missionary countries belonged to the Holy See. What Maréchal asked, Propaganda considered the *jus patronatus* over the American Church; and such a privilege would never be granted. The Sacred Congregation trusted Maréchal's good judgment, but feared the exercise of such a right by his successors. In a letter to Bishop Flaget (Baltimore, March 24, 1826—BCA—Case 21A—P 4), Maréchal writes: "*Lorsque j'etois à Rome, j'ai taché d'obtenir un decret du St. Siège conferant à l'archévêque réuni à ses Suffragants le droit exclusif de presenter les évêques pour les sièges vacans et à eriger. Ma demande etoit en bon train d'être accordée, lorsque malheureusement les scandales enormes de l'Abbé Inglesi eclatèrent.*" Maréchal explained that Inglesi belonged to New Orle ns, which was not then a suffragan See to Baltimore, but the Cardinals refused to consider further the granting of the Archbishop's request. "*Voyez, Monseigneur,*" one of them said to Maréchal, "*le danger ou serait exposée l'église d'Amérique, s'il y avoit sur le Siège de Balte. un prelat du genre de Mgr. Du Bourg!*"

[17]Maréchal to Plessis, Balto., June 25, 1821, printed in *Records* (ACHS), vol. XVIII, p. 445.

My very dear Lord and Confrère:

I have a bit of news for you that will surprise you greatly. I intend to sail on Monday next from New York for Havre, whence I shall push on to Rome after having stopped for two or three days at Paris.

I regret extremely that my excellent and affectionate friend, Doctor Cheverus, was unable to undertake this mission. But the state of his health and other obstacles would not permit him to leave his diocese, and therefore I was suddenly obliged to go.

As I unfortunately cannot receive letters from you before my departure, I beg you, my Lord, as a great favor, to be good enough to write to some of those prelates at Rome with whom you are acquainted; you know all about the lack of discernment shown by Propaganda. Its members mean well, I know, but they need to be better informed. I implore you to support the requests which I shall have to make to them for the good of our Church. You are aware of the measures that they have taken lately and of the evils that ensued in consequence. It is very essential to convince them that the itinerant and intriguing monks that beset them can only mislead them.

I am in the midst of the bustle of departure. Nevertheless I still have enough presence of mind to assure you of my profound respect and veneration.

Entirely and forever, Your humble servant,

✠Amb. *A.B.*[18]

Plessis had declined earlier in the year (February 7, 1821) to promote Maréchal's request: "My position is so different from yours that I have no reason to join you in a request for the right to nominate or to present for vacant sees and to determine upon the erection of future bishoprics... Do not think me, though, any the less disposed on this account to make common cause with you, in this sense, that I shall use all the influence I possess at Rome (and I still have some) to give to your just demands all the support of which I am capable."[19]

Ecclesiastical affairs in the American Church were being directed, influenced, and shaped by men whom Maréchal believed friendly to his views: Plessis of Quebec, Poynter of London, and Gradwell, Rector of the English College at Rome.

On July 30, 1821, a special congregation on American affairs re-

[18] *Records* (ACHS), vol. XIX, p. 445.
[19] *Ibid.*, vol. XVIII, p. 439.

plied again to Maréchal's request which had reached Propaganda by this curious route: Quebec, London, the English College at Rome. There is no doubt that Cardinal Fontana interpreted Maréchal's request as tantamount to the privilege of allowing the Metropolitan to present the candidate or candidates for all American Sees in the future. The Latin rescript in the Archiepiscopal Archives at Quebec, and the original Italian *restretto* in the *Atti* of 1821, express surprise that Maréchal should not know that Canon Law would not permit so sweeping a power in the head of the American Church. Joined to the first request regarding vacant Sees was another: that the strict laws of Benedict XIV regarding Religious Orders be extended to the United States. This likewise was refused. This information was given to Plessis by letter of November 17, 1821. The privilege to nominate to vacant Sees neither rested in the right of any Metropolitan nor could it be given to him by a special privilege.[20]

A month later, when Maréchal was in Rome and the question was again brought up before Fontana, the answer was emphatically in the negative. From Maréchal's letters after his visit to Rome, it is evident that he means to assert that Fontana was unfair in interpreting his request as a right, inherent in his Metropolitan jurisdiction, to nominate or to present to vacant American Sees. It is difficult to give any other interpretation to his request, and the bulky document in the *Atti* of 1821, showing how profoundly the question was studied by the Sacred Congregation, proves that his request could have meant nothing else. Propaganda could and did make mistakes in the practical organization of the Church here; but instinctively the Cardinals who composed its board of directors sensed the canonical values involved in Maréchal's bid for sovereignty. John Gilmary Shea has not given a favorable interpretation to Propaganda's decision. Maréchal was not, as Shea has written, "met with the sneering remark that the Archbishop of Baltimore and his suffragans had no right to nominate to vacant Sees."[21] He was told that Canon Law would not permit a system for filling vacant bishoprics in such a way that he or his suffragans should appear to be the sole *electors* of the incoming bishops. That right belonged to the Holy See exclusively. That Maréchal saw he had blundered is evi-

[20]Prop. Arch., *Lettere*, vol. 302, fol. 516.
[21]*Op. cit.*, vol. III, p. 71.

dent from a comparison between his letter to Plessis and one written to the Pope while in Rome. In this latter epistle he writes:

> We freely confess that we have no right to present Bishops for the province of Baltimore. No such right has ever been granted to us by the Holy See. Therefore we do not possess it. Nay more, I and my suffragans, who have occupied episcopal sees in America for many years, sincerely desire to be free from so formidable a burden... Yet it is certain that they must be nominated by some one; but who, considering the distance of North America from the Roman See, is to present capable and worthy subjects? Surely the Irish Bishops cannot do so to advantage... The Irish Bishops have only an imperfect knowledge of our America, such as they glean from geographies and books of travel. Unacquainted with the disposition and customs of our Americans, it is utterly impossible for them to nominate men who suit our States.[22]

Maréchal did, however, gain for himself and his suffragans the right but not the exclusive right of recommending candidates for vacant Sees.[23]

Maréchal insists upon Fontana's misconstruction of his request in a letter to Plessis, dated Baltimore, March 11, 1823: "Cardinal Fontana is assuredly mistaken about the nature of the request I made him in regard to the nominations to the bishoprics in my province. I never asked of the Holy See the right of nominating, either absolutely or as a privilege. The favor that I solicited for the good of religion was that Propaganda will write to us and listen to our reasons before it proceeds to nominate men recommended only by intriguing monks at Rome, or by bishops who have no knowledge whatever of our ecclesiastical affairs. Fortunately Propaganda yielded to my representations, and in the future will correspond with us before taking action, and will turn a deaf ear to the proposals of men who have misled it on more than one occasion."[24]

In looking back upon the causes which had impeded the progress of the Church in the United States for the previous decade, Bishop England wrote in 1833 that among the principal impediments to its advancement were:

> The unfortunate efforts made by others to give to the Catholic

[22] *Ibid.*, p. 71.
[23] Cf. Zwierlein, *Les premières nominations episcopales aux États-Unis* (*Mélanges Moeller*, vol. II, Louvain, 1914).
[24] *Records* (ACHS), vol. XVIII, p. 450.

Church in the United States a too close affinity with certain particular establishments in Europe. There is no jealousy of a close connection with Rome, for every American knows that such a union is essential to the Catholic Religion; but it is different in regard to other places and nations, for it is feared lest these may have some right of supervision or administration.

The absolute want of any sort of co-operation or of a common *modus agendi* among the Bishops, who for the most part held themselves apart and aloof one from another. Although each one did what he could, nevertheless schisms and other evils broke out; and these might easily have been repressed by the acts of a Council confirmed by the Holy See. There is great reason to believe that the schism which for so long a time afflicted Philadelphia, would still be rampant, if the Synod of 1829 had not, by its reports to Rome, placed the Holy See in a position to know more fully how to apply an opportune remedy.

Although the Archbishops of Baltimore have all been excellent men, nevertheless the opinion has been quite general that the successors of Bishop Carroll have not been the best fitted for that position, or dignity. Many other nominations to Bishoprics were not well received, and they did not turn out well. Some plan should be adopted to enable the Holy See to procure information on this important point. Although the priests have not yet spoken openly on this matter, nevertheless it would be leading the Holy See into error to say that either the clergy or the great body of the laity is content with nominations procured privately.

In the United States the appointment of persons fitted for ecclesiastical dignities is of more importance than in any part of Europe; since heretofore each Bishop had practically greater power in his own diocese than the Pope had in the Universal Church. For he had all the ordinary, and almost all the extraordinary, faculties without any Congregation or Council, or established discipline, to limit their exercise. Moreover, alone and without extraneous support he had in most cases to encounter the difficulties of his position, against adversaries of every kind; and great numbers of the clergy had the same power and the same difficulties.

The American people are, generally speaking, extremely intelligent, strict and close observers of public affairs, much given to study, very well educated, accustomed to respect personal merit rather than rank or office. Hence to send amongst them and to place in high positions persons whose qualifications are questionable, would result in destroying the utility and the influence of the positions they would be appointed to fill.

The people of the United States are wonderfully attached to their form of government; but they are very sparing and reserved in their praise of others. Many of the clergy who went thither from the continent of Europe not only have not wished to be subject to the United States and to be enrolled as citizens, but they did not hesitate to openly avow their predilection of Europe. Thus they not only have lost the confidence of the people, but on many occasions they created great prejudice against the Catholic Religion by furnishing grounds for the opinion that it was incompatible with the government of the United States.

Many priests complain that while the hierarchy is fully established in regard to Bishops, nothing has yet been done in regard to priests. They have only delegated jurisdiction which can be taken from them at the pleasure of the Bishops, and has frequently been so taken, without any chance for appeal, since no censure was inflicted. This power, up to a certain point, is absolutely required, as all confess; but many are of opinion that it would be well to form some parishes, and thus to give to the American Church a more perfect form, and to the older and more experienced among the clergy a more respectable standing.

The people of the United States are accustomed to have all their affairs transacted in accordance with fixed laws, and not according to the dictates of the will of an individual. They observe that nothing is done by the Holy See without previous consultation and deliberation. They know that in the Catholic Church the power of legislation resides in the Pope and the Bishops; and they would be greatly impressed if they would see the Church in America regulated in accordance with laws emanating from a Council of Bishops with the approbation of the Holy Father. The conformity of this mode of precedure with their own principles and practices is so striking, that it would easily gain not only their obedience but also their attachment. But they will never be reconciled to the practice of the bishop, and often times of the priest alone, giving orders without assigning any reasons for the same.

The want of a distinct and definite line of limitation between the rights of the clergy and those of the laity regarding the administration of Church property has occasioned most of the schisms and other evils that have desolated the Church.[25]

Meanwhile, in spite of Maréchal's reply that a Synod was not

[25] *Records* (ACHS), vol. VIII, pp. 459-462, copied from the Irish College *Portfolio*.

necessary on the score that the bishops did not need to discuss matters of Faith, Dr. England wrote again (August 8, 1821), renewing his appeal for a National Council:

> As to the Synod, though I did not think our united voices would reclaim the unfortunate Hogan, nor that we had authority as a Provincial Synod to interfere between the Bishop and him, yet I did and do contemplate the principle of the case as applying to us all and I thought the wisdom of my seniors would aid me in determining what would guard against the evils of Trusteeship in my Diocese. I thought the Bishop of Philadelphia and the Bishop of New York also needed aid and advice. I have seen the regulations your Grace alludes to. I must own I thought them very meagre, and I thought some additional statutes necessary, but though I knew I could legislate for my own Diocese, I did not wish to be singular and I wished the advice of my brethren before I should heartily do what perhaps might be wrong. Your Grace need not be informed that Chapter 2 de reform. Chapter XXIV Conc. Trid. mentioned various causes without touching on Faith and a definite time at which such Synod ought to be held. And I know Synods of both descriptions mentioned in that Chapter have been regularly held in Ireland though no article of Faith was discussed (upon which they have no power to decide) and with the best effects. I did think that what was good in Ireland would be good here to some of the Bishops of the States through the fact that when we should meet, each of us would have a great many things to lay before his brethren for advice. I know that by regular meetings of this sort, the other churches in this country are outstripping us, though we actually have more resources and a better cause; and I did think that by co-operation we might put forth our energies. Your Grace does not think so, I shall not press the subject this year farther upon your consideration, and meantime I shall endeavour to do the best I can with the means I have and suppose that I was perhaps in error when I thought a Synod could make better regulations than an individual.[26]

It was about this time (October 9, 1821) that Dr. England wrote to Archbishop Troy, giving the Dublin prelate, as we have already seen, a detailed explanation of the causes for the disorders in the Church here and putting the situation up clearly to Maréchal's refusal to call a Synod. Archbishop Troy sent this letter to Propaganda, and on February 21, 1822, the Cardinal-Prefect replied, ask-

[26]BCA—Case 16—J8.

ing Troy to communicate at once with the Bishop of Charleston and to urge him to send to Rome a fuller statement of the situation in the American Church. Propaganda shows, however, in its letter to Troy more concern over the news that Dr. England was translating the *Missal* than over the dissensions in America.

On February 21, 1822, Father Whitfield who was to succeed Maréchal, wrote to that prelate, who was then in France: "Report says that Dr. England was going to Rome, not to oppose your grace, but to obtain another Bishopric as the climate of Charleston does not agree with him. How true this report may be I cannot say, but certain it is he told a person that he intended to go to Rome for this purpose."[27] Hogan at this time, he adds, was also appealing for a National Synod.

With Maréchal at Rome, Dr. England realized that he had little hope of arousing Propaganda to a realization of the growing disorders here. At a time when he hoped the Sacred Congregation would be anxious for consultation on the question of a uniform ecclesiastical discipline in the country, he found himself harried by its officials because he had dared to print an American edition of the English translation of the *Roman Missal.* Valuable time was lost, as we have seen in a previous chapter, before the Sacred Congregation understood that Dr. England had merely reprinted the edition accepted by the hierarchy of Ireland. Fontana's attitude brought a sharp reply from the Bishop of Charleston:

> *Iterum testor judicium meum inconcussum esse et sententiam fere omnibus esse hujusmodi publicationes non solum utiles sed et necessarias esse, verumtamen judicio vestro obediens ero. Vobis, non mihi, posthac erit Deo Omnipotenti de hac vinea rationem reddere. Fidem Legesque Ecclesiae cognoscitis; videte autem quaeso, et humiliter sed fidenter vos moneo, videte, si ingenium hujusce populi vobis cognitum sit, principia legislationis vobis cognita sunt, anne facta hujusce Ecclesiae cognoscitis? Ex quo didicistis? Vestrum est videre!*[28]

On his way back to the United States, a letter from Propaganda, dated May 25, 1822, reached Maréchal at Paris. This letter contains the Sacred Congregation's solution for the difficulties in the Church here. The decisions given refer to the trustees, to the *presbyteri*

---

[27]BCA—Case 21—I6.
[28]Prop. Arch., *Scritt. rifer., Amer. Cent.*, vol. 7, fol. 16.

vagantes saepe profugi, to the disturbed condition of the Philadelphia Church, the division of the Diocese of Louisiana into three Sees, the erection of the See of Detroit, the obstacles to the spread of the Church in New England and in Virginia, the necessity of seminaries, etc. Two questions are asked for Maréchal's further consideration: Whether a Provincial Council might not be convoked for the purpose of bringing about a renewal of ecclesiastical discipline in the country, and whether diocesan Synods should not be held in the United States?[29]

A final decision was reached by Cardinal Consalvi, the Prefect of Propaganda, on July 20, 1822, regarding the filling of vacant Sees in the United States. The privilege was given to the archbishop and to his suffragans of proposing to Rome the names of those they believed worthy to fill episcopal Sees. Three names at least were to be chosen by the American hierarchy, *"tres saltem probatissimos viros quos magis idoneos ac vere dignos in Domino judicaverint Sacrae Congregationi commendent."*[30] Upon this method the hierarchy based its action in filling vacant or newly erected Sees until 1833. The decree of July 20, 1822, on nominations to episcopal Sees, contained a decision regarding priests coming from Ireland, which practically put an end to emigration from that quarter.

On October 29, 1822, Dr. England acknowledged Propaganda's letter of August 24, 1822, the first he had received from Rome since that of December 9, 1820. No mention is made of national conditions, his letter dealing mostly with Charleston. On receipt of the decree of July 20, 1822, Dr. England wrote to Maréchal as follows (December 22, 1822):

> I have first to apologize for the neglect of not having congratulated you upon your return to your Diocess, and to explain the causes—When I learned of your arrival I was in Columbia upon a visitation, and much engaged in endeavoring to make out a site for a church and endeavouring to dissipate some of the prejudices of our back country members; upon my return hither I had to close the year's examinations of the Academy, to give some particular instructions to a young man whom I have today ordained Deacon, and to give a week's retreat in my new wooden church to such of the laity as were disposed to pro-

[29] *Ibid., Lettere,* vol. 303, fol. 418.
[30] *Ibid.,* fol. 612.

fit thereby. These occupations together with procrastination gave to me an excuse for deferring what my disposition and affection and duty ought to have urged without delay. I hope however for your indulgence. I have to acknowledge the receipt of two copies of Rescripts from your Secretary together with a letter in which I was sorry to find an account of your illness. I trust Almighty God has ere now restored you to your health.

The copies of those rescripts exhibit no signature of the Prefect or Proprefect of the Congregation. Are the originals signed? If so, I should be glad to insert them on my Register. Otherwise I do not know that I can. That regarding the Irish Bishops giving unlimited and undeserved Exeats is very salutary. I had myself written to Rome to complain of the evil and to Ireland to those Bishops who I knew could have most influence to prevent the evil. I know what difficulties they create to prevent the coming out of any person who may be useful, and how readily they dismiss those who are useless, troublesome, or disorderly. For my part, I have determined to receive in the future no person who has been on the Irish mission and left it without having been sent for.

I have not received from the Bishop of Philadelphia the rescript regarding Hogan. I should wish to see it. Should Your Grace not be fully in possession of the part which I took in the affair, you will please to let me know and I shall send you copies of my letters to Doctor Conwell which have appeared in the *Miscellany* and contain the whole statement correctly. I have also sent to Rome at different times accurate statements of my share in the Transaction.

I am convinced that Hogan is not the author of this evil—though he should leave Philadelphia, the evils would not be removed. It is the natural consequence of the system upon which Catholicity has been established in Philadelphia. The same evil is in New York, the same is here, and I suspect you are not free from it in Baltimore, guarded as your bye-laws appear to be. I am inclined to think that I must part with the old Church here.

The anti-Catholic spirit is as strong and more inveterate than when this was a portion of your Diocese, and as a few infidels have the dominion of the church and cannot be dispossessed, I have no alternative but to beggar it, and myself with it; but though I suffer want for some time, I shall thus save religion and put down the system. I have made a statute prohibiting any clergyman under pain of suspension *ipso facto* to officiate in any Church in which there is a Pew in this Diocess, with the

exception of those already existing, and I have contrived to have the pews of the old church here nearly deserted and to live upon the voluntary offering of the few well disposed Catholics and to make the Priests earn their substance by teaching. Though this be unpleasant now it will produce good. . . . . .

If the clergy ceased by a common order to officiate in all the Trustee Churches until the titles were changed, what remedy could the people have? And if the Bishops unanimously gave the order what doubt but the clergy would obey? I may be wrong, but I have a strong conviction that all must ultimately end in this, and if so, no time could be better than the present when we could exhibit to the world the distinct ground of our act, the absolute usurpation of his Church from a Bishop by a junta of infidels and an excommunicated priest and no redress to be had. Look to the former evils, look to New York, look to this wretched disgraced and degraded Church of Charleston.

Surely there must be some remedy, and the remedy should be devised upon consultation and applied simultaneously. It is perhaps more inconvenient for me than for any other Bishop in the Union to attend a synod now, yet my conviction of its necessity is stronger than ever. If you call it I will go barefoot thereto sooner than defer examining and opposing this dreadful evil which must strengthen every day. There are many other causes, which render such a meeting necessary.

The Bishop of Philadelphia desires it. I do not know the sentiments of the other Bishops upon the subject. If you refuse to call it I shall lament that we are left divided to meet our several difficulties, and respectfully differ from your Grace in the opinion as to its expediency, unless you shall assign some stronger reason than I apprehend can be advanced against our meeting.[31]

In the extant correspondence between Dr. England and the archbishop there is an evident restraint on Charleston's part not to mention again the necessity of a Council to bring peace to the Church here. Occasionally, as we have seen, a word does escape him, as on January 15, 1823, when he says that there is little use of their corresponding on the trustee problem, and that he had lost interest in it, since Maréchal was deliberate in his design not to allow the suffragans to meet for mutual aid and consultation. By this time, the topic had become a painful one to him.

In a letter to Father William V. Harold (February 24, 1824),

---

[31] BCA—Case 16—M19.

Dr. England replied as follows to the charge the Dominican had made, namely, that the hierarchy did not wish order and peace in the country:

I request you will not include all the Bishops in your well-grounded charge. My conscience is at rest. My opinion coincides with yours. Upon my arrival in this country I looked for some rule to guide me. I found none. I requested the Archbishop to furnish me with some copies of the regulations or customs of other Churches. I got a meagre skeleton of imperfect statutes for the administration of the Sacraments, such as any schoolboy Theologian ought to have known. I did not wish to act precipitately. I requested the Archbishop would convene a Synod. The Bishop of Richmond, whose See has been most injudiciously and injuriously suppressed, joined my request. The Bishop of Philadelphia was, as far as I could perceive, desirous of it. The Bishop of New York told me he had no objection to join. But the Archbishop requested of me to inform him what articles of Faith we had to discuss! I ventured to reply that we could do nothing in Faith, but much for discipline. I stated the fact to which you allude, the Canon of the Council of Trent, my own feelings, and a variety of other, as I thought, cogent reasons, all to no purpose.

In my next communication to Rome I stated my opinion. I once again suggested to the Archbishop my conviction and wish. I was answered that he desired a Synod himself, but did not wish to bring the Bishops from their homes at inconvenience and expense. I stated this last objection I was sure would not weigh. I was the poorest, and one of the most distant, and though seldom worth money, I would gladly go. I was told that any difficulties I had might be solved by my submitting them to discussion at Baltimore.

The Archbishop would be happy to aid me by any lights which the Metropolitical city could afford, and that my own power was sufficient for the discipline of my own Diocess. I have, Sir, given you, perhaps unnecessarily, and not very prudently, this detail to show you why I have determined, during the administration of our present Archbishop, never to expect, never to suggest a Synod of the Bishops of the United States. Since then I have endeavoured to act as much as possible within my own sphere. I did in the year 1821 make a tour as far as New York. I preached very reluctantly in some places. I interfered, perhaps, too officiously in other places. My intentions were correct, my acts imprudent, but I have been taught to stay at home. Neither my inclination, nor my means, nor my duty

will permit me to make such another excursion. My duties multiply, the openings for exertion thicken about me, and I have to provide not only for myself but for the wants of eight or nine candidates and students amongst a people hardly brought to submit to system, and scarcely able to support themselves, in the midst of persons who watch us with the keen steadiness of the lynx, insinuate themselves into our affairs with the cunning of the serpent, and whilst they appear to possess the meekness of the dove, resist us with the nerve of the lion; and whilst they injure us, they defame us, and publish to the world that they only act in self-defence against irreligious and unprincipled aggressors.

I am not then, Sir, likely to go beyond the bounds of my own Diocess for a long time, and shall not have the pleasure of meeting you, unless you come below the 36th degree.[32]

Dr. England could not, however, keep silent. He believed that the schism in Philadelphia would be extinguished very quickly, if Maréchal would do his duty, and said so quite plainly in a letter to the archbishop on April 11, 1824.[33] Practically a whole year passed before Dr. England ventured again to suggest the Council to Maréchal. On January 7, 1825, he wrote:

I can not look abroad unconcernedly... I can not help again pressing upon you the necessity of cooperation. You are the individual upon whom it depends to bring it to force. Every day more firmly adds to the conviction of my mind of the propriety, the necessity of a meeting of the Bishops. No time would for many reasons be more proper than the present. New York and Philadelphia are so near that to them a day's notice would be enough. Cincinnati is in Washington. I shall immediately obey the summons. Probably, the Bishop of Bardstown and his coadjutor could not soon be with us, if at all, but even to these much good would be done by the meeting of you and four of your suffragans. Believe me it will do more good than you anticipate.[34]

The first application of the new law regarding nominations to vacant Sees occurred after Bishop Connolly's death (February 5, 1825). On February 11, Maréchal wrote to his suffragans asking them for the names of priests who would be worthy of the See: Dr. England answered on February 18:

---

[32]Dominican Archives at Tallaght, Ireland.
[33]England to Maréchal, Charleston, April 11, 1824 (BCA—Case 16—J12).
[34]BCA—Case 16—K22.

I have this instant received your letter of the 11th, marked *confidential.*

Of the contents, save your request to know my opinion of who ought to succeed Dr. Connolly, I had been previously informed. May God be merciful to him, so far as his abilities could reach he was as good a Bishop as New York will probably have again.

I have not a second's hesitation in stating without any restriction of confidence that Mr. Power is inquestionably the best successor he could have—& that any other choice would be likely to involve us in still more serious embarrassments than we are even now. I know New York well—I am intimately acquainted with most of its leading Catholic members. I know how in critical and dangerous moments Mr. Power has kept them together. I know that no gunpowder was more calculated to explode from the falling of one spark than New York is. And I do not before God know any other man who can so effectually prevent it as Mr. Power. I know his faith to be most pure—his morality unimpeached, his zeal to be ardent. I believe his judgment to be correct. I know his knowledge is extensive for his years,—his abilities of a very high order,—and his integrity unbending, his courage I have often known to be well proved, his disposition is more for active life, but his piety is solid.

Believe me if the same system which has been pursued respecting Boston be pursued respecting New York—it will not do. I conjure you, in any representation which you make, to insist upon the principle that if Rome wishes to have our religion establish itself here, the reasonable wishes of the people must be taken into account,—& that one of their first & most reasonable wishes is that the clergyman who toils with merit here should succeed to the several churches, & not men who are strangers to the place, strangers to the people, strangers to the government, & strangers to the principles by which the people can & will be led.

I know well what Mr. Power was in Ireland. I know what Mr. Taylor was—I know also the character and abilities of the gentleman whom it was thought to select for our *first vacant* Mitre, one of them I respect.—*But both are totally unfit.*

With perhaps some just reasons which I cannot discover, *I feel* that I am a sort of stranger amongst most of my brethren. —I shall therefore interfere as little as possible outside my own Diocess. I have enough & more than enough to do at home. But with the liberty which becomes my order, I warn you respectfully as the head of the American Church, that there is at present a system pursued in Rome of tampering with & influencing the Propaganda regarding nominations to our Sees

which if yielded to will be fatal.—My influence is nothing, but the influence of a National Synod would be much.—You can not be expected to act upon what you might not know.—But I do know the grounds of my assertions. I can not however feel that I ought to communicate them *in writing to anyone.* No one respects the Propaganda more than I do— But if that body will listen to suggestions in Rome respecting this country, in place of taking reports of the Bishops here as they ought to be taken —I shall deeply regret it.[35]

On August 27, 1825, Propaganda wrote to Bishop England reproaching him for the tone of his last letter and assuring him that the entire situation of the Church here was well known in Rome and that his advice was not needed.[36] A copy of this letter was sent to Dr. Conwell to soothe the latter's feelings. It was this rebuke which prompted Dr. England to write a letter on November 4, 1825, in which he boldly told Cardinal Della Somaglia: *"Omnia Romae nota non esse, ut ex litteris Eminentiae Vestrae patet!"* This practically ended his correspondence with Rome for the next five years.[37]

The attitude of the American Church in the matter of filling vacant Sees is reflected in a letter which Bishop Du Bourg wrote at this time to all the suffragans, dated Natchitoches, Louisiana, October 4, 1825:

Right Rev. Sirs and Very Dear Brethren,

About one year ago, if my memory serves me well as to time, I received an invitation from *Propaganda,* which I must suppose to have been addressed also to every Bishop in the United States to give my opinion for the appointment of a successor to Dr. Cheverus in the See of Boston; and just now a similar one has reached me, respecting that of New York, vacated by the death of Dr. Connolly. From this it is natural to conclude that the Sacred Congregation has come to a settled plan, not to proceed henceforth in the American nominations, but upon the joint suffrages of the American Bishops.

The plan is, no doubt, a very correct one in every point of view. But its efficacy must necessarily depend upon the mode of carrying it into operation. The present one appears to me extremely defective inasmuch as the unavoidable discrepancy of insulated opinions must necessarily throw Propaganda into the greatest perplexity as to the choice of one subject among the

[35]BCA—Case 16—J14.
[36]Prop. Arch., *Lettere,* vol. 306, fol. 418.
[37]*Ibid., Scritt. rifer., Amer. Cent.,* vol. 6.

several that may be proposed, particularly as each of them may eventually chance to obtain but a single vote in his favor: the consequence of which must be an indefinite protraction in the appointments, the greatest calamity that can befall our infant Churches.

Reunion of Bishops on those all important occasions, would, if practicable, be the best remedy to the impending evil, and for my part, cost what it might, neither fatigue nor expense would deter me from attempting a long journey on an errand of such interest to Religion. I allow, however, that in many cases, either the advanced age, infirmities, or even the poverty of some of the Prelates might throw insuperable obstacles in the way of these desirable meetings. At least would I propose an understanding among the Bishops, by means of epistolary communications. The Archbishop, or in case of his absence, or death, the oldest Bishop might be commissioned by the Holy See, in the emergency of any vacancy, to confer by letters, with his colleagues, to suggest to each of them his own ideas, to receive theirs in return, and in case of such division of opinions as might still embarrass the nominations, to acquaint them with the number of votes given to each of them, in order that, upon a new consideration of the subject, the Bishops might, if they thought proper, modify their former opinions, and join in making a common return. Intricate as this process may appear, it seems to me by far the most expeditious and the best calculated to satisfy the minds of the Sacred Congregation, by affording them at once a full view of the general opinion of the Bishops on the respective merits of the candidates.

A far shorter cut assuredly would be that every Bishop should be provided with a Coadjutor to succeed him on his demise. But this, I am sensible, may be liable to many objections, flowing chiefly from the difficulty of making provisions for *two* Bishops when a sufficient maintenance can hardly be found for *one*. I should conceive, however, that titular Bishops themselves being happily exempt in this country from every kind of costly representation, Coadjutors might, with still greater reason, be contented for the support of their Episcopal dignity with the same emoluments deemed sufficient to support them as subordinate Pastors. Be it as it may I cannot help thinking that it is a strong idea entertained, I am told, in some of the ecclesiastical offices at Rome, that Coadjutors should not be granted to Bishops on foreign Missions but in cases of extreme necessity; and though at present, personally disinterested on the subject I would willingly propose to my Brethren to join in a simultaneous address to Propaganda pointing out the happy results that would arise

from this measure in keeping up uniformity in the administration, insuring the continuation of establishments commenced, precluding intrigues and warding off the manifold dangers attending protracted vacancy. All that should be reasonably required would be that the Titular demanding such an auxiliary should present satisfactory vouchers on the merits of the subject proposed by him, supported by the suffrages of *two*, at least, of the other Bishops.

Shall I not be accused of intrusion in this presuming to take the initiative, in a matter, which as it regards all my colleagues, would, with more propriety have been canvassed by any of them than by me, the least of all? I must own that this reflection has long deterred me from any such communication. Yet, recollecting the word of St. Cyprian "Episcopatus est in solidum" which is particularly enforced in the application made to each of us by the Holy See, I have concluded that every member of the Episcopal body is strictly indebted to all of his Brethren for a candid disclosure of all his own views towards the consolidation and advancement of the common interest, and consequently that it were in me a breach of duty amounting to the most culpable indifference to Religion to withdraw from my colleagues those lights which I may, though, perhaps, erroneously, deem useful for our common guidance. I fondly hope therefore to be pardoned, not only for the foregoing hints, but also for the communication of my answer to Propaganda, with respect to the new appointment, the whole of which I mean to submit to the superior judgment of my brethren and most Reverend Masters, with an entire deference to, and a cordial acquiescence in their decisions.

At the time the venerated Patriarch of the American Church, Archbishop Carroll, was soliciting the division of his then immense Diocese, he was, as he himself repeatedly told me particularly desirous to see Boston and New York united under one Bishop and could not help manifesting some vexation that the contrary opinion had prevailed at Rome. His chief reasons were, the propinquity of those two cities, which made it easy to travel from one to the other in a couple of days and the comparatively small number of Catholic Congregations in both territories, particularly in that of New England; which would render the situation of a Bishop in Boston hardly dissimilar from that of a simple parish-priest; a situation truly discouraging for a prelate of an active mind, and little honorable to Episcopacy. I was forcibly struck at these observations, which since have turned to be real forebodings. For who doubts now, but to the circumstance of the insignificancy of the See of

Boston is chiefly due the irretrievable loss for America of its late Incumbent? In consequence therefore of these reflections, when Propaganda did me the honor of consulting me on the nomination to the Church vacated by the translation of Dr. Cheverus I clearly expressed my opinion of the propriety of reuniting Boston and New York under one spiritual head; and in answer to the present call I renew my answer to the same effect.

Now as to the designation of subjects fit to fill up that most important station and particularly (to use the expression of Propaganda) to raise the Church of New York from the state of depression and distraction into which it is fallen. I have returned four names, viz.:

1. The Rev. Ben. Fenwick,
2. The Rev. Demetrius de Galitzin,
3. The Rev. M. McGuire, of Pittsburg,
4. The Rev. J. Power, of New York,

giving it as my decided opinion, that however eminent the merits of the three latter may be, which I hold in the highest estimation, the first should unhesitatingly be preferred: 1st, as a *Native American,* a circumstance which, in the present state of the church at New York distracted as it is by foreign parties, highly qualifies the Rev. Ben. Fenwick as a mediator of peace; 2ndly, as having already been most successfully employed in stations of high responsibility, particularly in New York and Charleston; in both of which he established a character of consummate prudence, indefatigable industry and eminent talents and whence he carried with him the respect and regrets of all classes of inhabitants without any difference of Religions or of nations. With great respect and brotherly attachment, I remain, Right Reverend and very dear Brethren,

Your most humble servant,

✠L. Wm.

Bishop of New Orleans.[38]

Certainly, if anything should have disturbed the equanimity of Maréchal regarding the jurisdiction over the American Church which was legitimately his to use for the protection of the Faith in this country, the serious situation which developed in Philadelphia between April and October, 1826, should have done so. The pact between Dr. Conwell and the trustees in October-November, 1826,

---

[38] *Ibid.*, vol. 8; printed in the *St. Louis Catholic Historical Review,* vol. III, pp. 209-211.

created a sensation, since it expressly gave the *jus nominandi pastorem* to the laity.

Dr. England chanced early in 1827 to add to Maréchal's troubles. He wrote on February 12, asking that Archbishop to give his opinion on the orthodoxy of several answers in Dr. Conwell's new *Catechism.* The letter is important not so much for its contents, as for its tone of cool sarcasm. It is one of several evidences we have to the fact that Dr. England had taken a stand of aloofness from all Church concerns outside his diocese. Maréchal answered his query, and in his letter suggested the advisability of a common Catechism for the country. What was the use, England replied, of making such a suggestion, since as in all other concerns that are common to the Church, Maréchal was keeping the bishops carefully apart "in our separated States"?[39]

A month later, Dr. England was contemplating a Diocesan Synod for the Carolinas and Georgia. He wrote to the archbishop on March 29, 1827, from Augusta, Ga.:

> I feel it time for me to do something more than I have yet effected, to give my Diocess a canonical organization and a set of Statutes. I feel also and acknowledge the serious inconvenience of having unlike customs and dissonant discipline within the same province. I am, as I have always been, most desirous of meeting you and my brethren for consultation upon the general concerns of that portion of the Church committed to our care. On my part, and I state it to remove any obstacle on that ground, there is not any want of kindly feeling and charity and episcopal affection for my brother of Philadelphia or any other in the Province. I am desirous farther of having the Statutes and customs of my Diocess based upon the decisions and regulations of a Provincial Synod—which I have frequently entreated you to assemble. I do not wish to be considered importunate, though I am in earnest. May I request that you will have the goodness to inform me whether you have any intention of immediately holding such a Synod? If it will assemble before the fall, I shall wait its issue before I proceed farther; and if it will not be held within the present year, I shall proceed to discharge what I conceive to be my duty to my Diocess by making for it the best Statutes that I can.[40]

---

[39]BCA—Case 16—J15, K23.
[40]BCA—Case 16—J16.

Unfortunately Dr. England's correspondence does not contain Maréchal's reply, but on the back of the letter in Maréchal's hand is the crisp word—*negative.*

Bishop England believed firmly that the disorganized state of discipline in the American Church was due in large measure to the stand taken by Maréchal and by some of his suffragans on the question of statutory legislation. The situation was now to reach its logical climax in the appeal of one priest, away from an authority he could legitimately expect to act in his case, namely the Metropolitan of Baltimore, to no less a court than that of the United States government. The following letter from Father William Vincent Harold, O. P., while somewhat confused on account of the emotion under which it was written, places the situation in Philadelphia as clearly to-day as it must have been to Maréchal, who received it in April, 1827:

> The account of your state of health and your decisive refusal to interpose in the proceeding by which I have been publicly stigmatized, contained in Your Grace's letter of the 16th instant, would forbid me giving you further trouble, did I not feel that I owe it to truth, and in some degree to the very instinct of self preservation to complain of the facility with which you appear to assume the fact that I have lived on unfriendly terms with Doctor Conwell.
>
> I am not ignorant of the eager credulity which some reverend gentlemen have manifested when the character of an Irish priest was to be impeached; yet I had a right to hope for a more tender regard in this respect from Your Grace, not only because of the dignity of your station but because the same conscientious scrupulousness which has withheld you from giving my case even a hearing, might be reasonably expected to extend itself to every fact connected with that case. I had not even a coolness with Doctor Conwell, before the Famous Agreement with the Trustees in October, 1826. That I disapproved of it will not be imputed to me as a crime by an impartial person. I knew that, from the month of June previous to that agreement when he had made up his mind to surrender the rights for which he had contended and to sacrifice the men who had enabled him to maintain them, Doctor Conwell was circulating the most extravagant and injurious reports respecting me; yet even then I dissembled all knowledge of his weakness in this respect because I would not be said to live on unfriendly terms with him. From the time of the Agreement

he chose to treat me with aversion and as soon as he found that I had transmitted a copy of it to Rome, he deprived me of the office of Vicar-General, alleging that I had been guilty of disrespectful conduct and language to him, but declining to specify anything by which this charge could be made susceptible of investigation. Your letter to me on that occasion abounds in compliments and assurance, the sincerity of which would no doubt be manifested in the case we are now discussing, had conscience left you at liberty to give expression to your feelings for the wrongs I suffer, or to evince anything like anxiety for my future prospects or reputation. When Doctor Conwell suspended me from all ecclesiastical functions without assigning any reason, I endeavoured to give your Grace an opportunity of ascertaining the causes which moved the Bishop to this proceeding, and the facts which he could adduce to justify it. You rejected the appeal and assume the fact, but it is not my wish to blame a decision which Your Grace describes as in accordance with the dictates of your conscience.

Your Grace is pleased to style this country a mere land of missions where the priest employed in the sacred ministry "can be removed at any time", and though you readily acknowledge that such a system "is obvious to some inconveniences", you seem convinced that it is the best to promote the good of Religion in a country like this; and you speak of the Catholic missions in the Kingdom of England as affording a parallel case with that of the Catholic Churches in the United States.

That the churches of the United States are still governed as if this were a mere land of missions is too true; but it does not follow from this mere fact that such a system is either suited to the actual constitution of these churches or the most expedient for the interests of religion. I am persuaded that it is neither the one nor the other. Your Grace appears to have forgotten that in the Kingdom of England the Catholic religion is yet only tolerated after ages of direct persecution, that it has not one Catholic diocese, or Catholic bishop, save only in ordination, being governed by Vicars-Apostolic removable at will, that until within a few years the only clergy publicly known there were the chaplains of the foreign ambassadors, whilst in the country-parts a few chaplains of ancient Catholic families administered the consolations of our Religion by stealth or suffrance. Does any one of these circumstances apply to the United States? Are we a persecuted people? Are our Bishops mere Vicars-Apostolic, not daring to call themselves Bishops of Baltimore, of Philadelphia, and so

forth, any more than the highly respectable Bishop Poynter would dare to assume the title of Archbishop of Canterbury or Bishop of London? That the English clergy should have no permanent title is an inevitable consequence of the want of permanent title in the Vicars-Apostolic. It would be strange indeed if the superstructure were to be considered permanent whilst the foundation is of necessity moveable, and if the argument on which Your Grace seems to rely, drawn from the inconsistency of a permanent right with "the very nature of a religion", were any thing more than a *petitio principii*, it would tend to the conclusion that our bishops are in every canonical sense ordinaries; our churches are as much diocesan as those of France or Italy. The splendid metropolitan church of Baltimore; or the richly endowed Cathedral of St. Patrick's at New York with their episcopal thrones and whatever else belongs to the splendor of the episcopal office might well attest that this land is something very different from a land of mere missions where the messenger of the Gospel of Christ holds his liberty or his life by mere sufferance.

It would be difficult to account for the predilection of Your Grace in favour of a system of rule so incompatible with the very nature of your own title, if one did not know how strange are the effects of uncontrolled power on whoever has once exercised it, let his natural benevolence and wisdom be ever so genuine. It is in the very nature of man, when once raised above the level of his fellow creatures, to imagine the short road of absolute power to be the best for attaining the ends of government; and the temptation to overlook the sufferings to which others become subjected in the operation of the system is so insidious that I must rather lament than condemn the want of sensibility which Your Grace betrays when you call such sufferings as I now endure by the name of *inconveniences* and when in another place you resolve the worst acts of Doctor Conwell into an attempt to induce me to leave his diocese, without a single expression which might mark your abhorrence of the moral complexion of such an attempt, and the monstrous abuse of a power which you are pleased to attribute to the bishops of this country. The power of banishing an American citizen under the cloak of spiritual right is a species of tyranny for which this country is not yet prepared. If this be the *utitur jure suo* claimed by the Catholic Bishops in this free land, I think I can assure Your Grace it will not be endured. I cannot concur in your impression, that my reputation is in no danger from the conduct of Dr. Conwell towards

me; when he not only deprives me of the office which he invited me from Europe to exercise but also of the liberty of celebrating Mass, which is never refused to any priest and much less taken from him except in the cases detailed in my last letter. But I am even less anxious to discuss this point, though vitally interesting to myself, than to commune with you on the ruinous effects which the present system must produce on the moral character of our clergy, on the religious character of our people and on the reputation of the Catholic Religion among the good people of the United States, already too much prejudiced against it.

It is painful to look forward to the sort of clergy which this unmitigated despotism must produce; destroying as it must every principle of honest candour in the breast of its victim, withering the moral feeling which renders reputation dearer than life. Such men would become fit for any purpose however wicked in the hands of a bishop, divested himself of every sensibility except the sensibilities belonging to the worst passions. Does he want to get rid of a priest from motives of petty jealousy? Is he ashamed or afraid to take the responsibility of the attempt on his own shoulders? He will command any number of his clergy he thinks fit, to sign a condemnation of the intended victim's conduct and whisper away his character and if any one of them hesitates to comply with so unholy a desire he knows that vengeance is laid up for him and the *utitur jure suo* shall bar not only his hope of redress but his right to complain. I do not draw this picture from mere fancy. I fear the obligation I owe to the claim of self-defence will compel me to exhibit a shocking exemplification of this case to other eyes than yours, for it appears that in you there is no authority to protect us. For the present I would only ask, with what effect the Catholic Religion can be inculcated by a clergy debased by servile fear and rendered utterly heartless by this necessity of humoring a man whom no law restrains? Can the Catholic people listen with docility to the moral principles inculcated by men who dare not act towards each other on the principles which they inculcated? What is to become of the rising generation who can see nothing, hear nothing of the church which is to lead them to heaven, that does not put it in the aspect of a despotic government in which if the virtue of one Bishop promises to fructify, it must be in defense of the system, whilst the madness of another may lay waste the flock of Christ with impunity? Surely it is an oversight in Your Grace to speak of such a system of rule "as the best to promote the good of religion in a

country like this". I think it must scandalize those who are but too little acquainted with the principles of the Catholic religion to have it said that its interests require such means; in this or in any country such an assertion might furnish a most insidious argument against the truth of our holy religion, if it were not too manifest an oversight to have made it. But in truth, the very existence of the system threatens to become fatal to the interests of the Catholic Religion in this very country above all others, for our citizens understand no government except one of law. The government of the Catholic Church is in the strictest sense a government of law, and it is only when it shall have become known and felt as such in this free country that the true interest of our religion can be promoted.

I do not wish, Most Reverend Archbishop, to subject you to the inconvenience of a correspondence in your delicate state of health. I respect your motives; nay your very prejudices; but on a question to which even the personal injury inflicted on one becomes nothing in contrast with the vital interests of the Catholic faith, brought to issue by the course adopted towards me, and the avowal of such principles of government as Your Grace has made, it is a duty incumbent even on an individual humble as I am, to speak out, having no fear before his eye, save only the fear of God.[41]

The only control over arbitrary episcopal authority, in the event of Maréchal's refusal to call his suffragans together for a uniform system of legislation, was the Holy See. But the appointment of incompetent prelates had lessened the respect the clergy ordinarily had for Rome. Harold had challenged Maréchal to create a court of refuge for cases like his own, else the American government would be appealed to for redress against the decisions of the Holy See.

Nothing, of course, will ever fully excuse Harold's appeal to Henry Clay, Secretary of State, on July 2, 1828. The correspondence, however, which passed between Philadelphia, Washington, Paris and Rome, in 1828-1829, is evidence complete and convincing of the extraordinary pass that had come to ecclesiastical discipline in this country, and was the outstanding proof for all of Dr. England's predictions of what might happen in the absence of a uni-

[41]BCA—Case 17—H4.

form canonical legislation for the mutual protection of priest and bishop.[42]

Meanwhile Archbishop Maréchal answered Dr. England again denying the necessity of a Council but asking him to send to Baltimore a list of the subjects or topics he wished to have treated in a Council; and on April 26, 1827, Dr. England wrote, from Savannah:

> When I wrote to you respecting the Provincial Synod, I wrote from a sense of duty and not with the hope that you would summon the meeting. This being a subject upon which I am, I regret to say, greatly but respectfully at variance with you, I feel I owe it to you and to myself to be explicit and candid. And I trust that you will attribute not to disrespect or unkind feeling any expression which a desire to be candid will dictate.
>
> I am under the impression that you neither wish for, nor intend to summon, a Synod. I am bound, as well from the general principles of charity, and also from my firm belief of your good intentions, and my respect for your zeal and virtues, to feel convinced, as I do sincerely, that you do in your conscience judge it would be improper to call one. Thus without examining, what it would be folly to guess at, what might be the reasons for your determination, I believe that determination to have been made, and as you believe, correctly. My judgment leads me altogether to an opposite result. I not only think it would be useful, but I believe it absolutely necessary, and that the evils which unfortunately do exist will scarcely if at all, and only after increase of extent and duration, be healed before one is called. And my not more frequently and earnestly pressing the subject upon your consideration is not the result of any doubt, but of absolute despair of your coming into my view of the subject. I therefore content myself with doing as much as acquits my own conscience without uselessly annoying you. Whilst I am under this impression you will acknowledge that it would be ludicrous on my part to send you questions or topics to be discussed at a meeting for holding which I believe there is not even a remote disposition. Should you assure me that I am in error and state to me when such a meeting is likely to be held, I shall feel it to be my duty seriously to consider what I would submit and give whatever notice of it to you and to my brethren you may judge necessary.
>
> You will now very naturally ask, why I wrote to you as I

---

[42]This correspondence is printed in England's *Works* (Reynolds), vol. V, pp. 213-232.

did, if such were my impressions. My answer is very short. The Bishop of New York in a letter to me some time in the beginning of this year passed an indiscreet censure upon me, for having without the advice and concurrence of my brethren of the Province made serious and important regulations in my Diocess. I felt that I would have merited the censure if I could have deferred making the regulations until I should have had the opportunity of such advice and concurrence. You will recollect that from my arrival I have been anxious and pressing to have such opportunity, but your judgment was opposed to my wishes. I thought also that the circumstances of my Diocess pressed upon me to make the regulations so that I am under the impression that although my brother of New York was correct in principle he was not so in its application. When I received his letter I was contemplating the formation of Diocesan Statutes and special discipline. I felt as I wrote that if there was any likelihood of my having an opportunity of receiving the advice and concurrence of my brethren, I would act rashly in not waiting for some time to obtain it and of course I could ascertain with probability what must otherwise appear to be an inconsistency on my part. If I withhold what you ask for, it is because I am under the impression that it would be folly to prepare subjects for a meeting which is not likely to be held.

To me, differing in opinion with you upon this subject, as I do very widely though respectfully, there exists a very great delicacy in pointing out causes which I was always led to believe made such a meeting *imperative,* but as I am not the canonical judge, I must suppose my opinion unfounded. I shall mention one which before now I was in the habit of thinking might be otherwise regulated, but now I am convinced is a case which decidedly calls for such a tribunal. The Philadelphia case. Besides the *variety of causes* which led the Council of Trent to require triennial Synods (which the policy of some European countries has for not the best reasons counteracted) such a case as that of Philadelphia specially requires its interference. I look upon the Metropolitan as having the right to receive and upon appeal to decide upon censure. I am altogether ignorant of whether such appeals were made to you or decided upon by you. I suppose all that has come before you in this way to have been properly and sufficiently due. But beyond that you have as Metropolitan no right, as a sole Prelate, to interfere except upon a neglect of a Synod, which Synod has not been negligent. But when a church within a province has been in dis-

order during a number of years, whether it arises from the weakness or the criminality of the bishop or from other causes, it is, I have no doubt as I do not feel it necessary upon such a point to quote to you the special canons, the *duty* of the Provincial Synod to interfere, if the Bishop wants aid, to give it, if it be his fault, to correct it, unless it be a *causa major*, and, if it be a *causa major* to claim the judgment and aid of Rome. I have known many worse causes very easily healed by the intervention of the Provincial tribunal. And I have known the national Synod of Ireland obliged to interfere to correct the majority of a whole province in a case much more difficult than any which has occurred, or is I hope likely to occur, in our Province. And you will excuse me, for giving the opinion, that the Philadelphia case is one which alone would be sufficient to command our attention in a canonical way. I know that in Ireland they are frequently held for causes far less in importance.

I have stated this as an extraordinary case, but, Most Reverend Sir, when I first sought and always desired a Synod, this was not the only cause, there were others of a more permanent character, of a more important bearing and of more general interest, to enter into the details of which would be as if I desired to force you to act according to my wishes. I would merely suggest to your own zeal and piety: Whether the spirit of the Church does not recommend and the canons require synods. Whether it is not very necessary that we should know each other, confide in each other, consult with each other and be united to each other whilst our adversaries are combined systematically against us. Whether we have any national discipline. Whether it is not fit to make a commencement. Whether we are not already becoming a separated number of Pastors without any spirit of unity, unity of custom, unity of discipline, unity of action, unity of purpose, unity of affection. Whether in any one sense of the word we form a national Church save in name. We are young and these things are new, but my impression is that the evils are making progress and the remedy ought to be applied in time. I know and trust I shall always protect the rights of an individual Bishop within his own Diocess, but I believe that his power is not without its checks from the Synod of the Province as well as of the whole Church and of the Holy See. I do not at present know any power of a metropolitan within my Diocess, except where I might have inflicted a censure, but Sir, I am one of those who deeply lament the curtailment of metropolitical power; do not suspect me of desiring to limit or to

abolish, what I would restore! But I know of only one mode to which I would assent, let the Synod determine, let Rome assert, let the Metropolitan execute. It has sometimes struck me that my motives might have been misunderstood, and that fears might be entertained of any intermeddling in what was not my concern. If such was the case I assure you it was a mistake. I love too well the good of the Church, the glory of God, the well-being of religion, the credit of my order, and the salvation of my soul.

Allow me, Most Reverend and Dear Sir, if any expression in this should appear harsh, to apologize and to retract it. I respect you highly, though I differ widely from your principles of prudence. I have been emboldened by the spirit and letter of the Canons, and what I know to be the general wish being on my side. You may say that I am perhaps under a mistake, but I thought it right to be respectfully explicit.

May God direct the resolve which you shall make as it belongs to you to judge. Mine is to give my opinion and to acquiesce in your decision. Be that what it may, be assured, Most Reverend Sir, of my esteem.[43]

This letter likewise has but one word *a tergo* in Maréchal's hand: *negative.* In the Dominican Archives at Tallaght there is a letter from Dr. England to Father John Ryan, O. P., dated Charleston, May 27, 1827, which contains the same sentiment:

I mentioned to Dr. Flaget and others of my brethren what I have more than once and lately communicated respectfully to the Archbishop, viz.: *That I differed altogether in opinion from his policy of governing this Church.* I must still humbly think that under the present system, neither peace nor respectability will be found in the American Church. No person is I trust more disposed to protect and defend the rights of the Holy See than I am, but Rome can neither be expected to know, or looked to, for the regulation of what ought to be examined and regulated at home by our own hierarchy under her sanction. I have more than once urged that the Archbishop should take the proper steps for having the Philadelphia case examined under the last clause of Chapt. V. De Ref. sess. XXIV, Conc. Trid., and, if, what I do not believe is likely, upon an examination it should be found to come more properly under its first portion, much time and labour would have been saved in having the materials prepared for the commissioners. But a far better effect would be showing all

[43]BCA—Case 16—K24.

concerned that there was a tribunal at home to repress the excess of *any* individuals. I cannot however assemble that tribunal, and it is not my place to sit in judgment upon him who could and perhaps ought to have long since summoned it —I cannot be as yet persuaded but that persons who opposed me without any reason, when I meant to have process according to the old and approved ecclesiastical customs, will be themselves the victim to principles which were then acted upon to maintain what I then and now looked upon and consider little less than despotism. However, I perhaps am in error.

Maréchal's answer to England's letter of April 26 is apparently lost. Its tenor may be seen, however, in Dr. England's reply of June 25, 1827:

I greatly regret the trouble which you had in writing so long a letter in your state of ill health. I have to make my acknowledgments for your appreciating my motive. I expect the same indulgence at present, *as it will probably be the last time that I shall have to address you upon this subject.* I do it only that, should I live, I might be able at a future day to feel that if evils should arrive I had no share in producing or permitting them. The following declarations are made therefore in that spirit, with perfect respect for you individually, for your office of Archbishop and for your experience. I also acknowledge that my opinions ought not to be yielded to by you against your own convictions.

I have been furnished with a printed copy of the documents respecting Mr. Harold's case as regards the Bishop of Philadelphia, and as respecting you. Upon the merits of either gentleman, or upon the merits of the cases or upon your declaration that no ground existed for an application, I pronounce no opinion, I express no sentiment.

But viewing the whole state of the American church, I state that it has no discipline or semblance of discipline and that in my opinion most of the evils which affect it arise from this cause; that each Diocess is affected more or less by the disorder, or the other evils existing in any other; and that therefore the special evils in each are in some measure a common concern of the whole and that this has been acknowledged by the Church from the beginning, as an undoubted principle felt through all its Provinces.

And although Rome is the mother and mistress of all churches, and that every Prelate owes to the Bishop of Rome the canonical obedience by divine appointment, yet that the

regulation of local discipline has not been usually made by Rome, but by the Provincial Bishops with the approbation of Rome, and that it is in the nature of things impossible for the tribunals in Rome to know, as well as the Bishops of America can, the discipline most beneficial to the American church (*sic*).

That is my humble opinion. The deranged and unsettled state of the American Church can be reduced to order and peace and permanent system only by Provincial Synods of the American Hierarchy. That much as I would value even the temporary quiet and highly as I would esteem and reverence and faithfully as I would obey a Papal legate, I solemnly and earnestly deprecate and am averse to this extraordinary mode of doing what I think might be better done by the proper and ordinary mode of a Provincial Synod. Because the usual mode of a Synod has not been tried. Because the usual mode of a Synod is more congenial to the practice of the Church. Because the usual mode of a Synod is more congenial to the old canons of the Church. Because the usual mode of a Synod has been prescribed by the last general council. Because the usual mode of a Synod has been found most beneficial in those places in which it has been followed. Because the usual mode of a Synod has been preferred by most holy Prelates whose example is most precious and useful in the Church. Because the usual mode of a Synod is more in accordance with the spirit of our National institutions, and because it is the mode which will best please the flock and insure their support to its regulations. Whereas placing the power in the hands of an individual appears to me an encroachment upon the rights of Diocesan Bishops, and an attempt to reduce them to the level of Vicars-Apostolic. It destroys what Cardinal Bellarmine calls the republican part of Church government, and properly states to be one of its characteristics, and is calculated in this country to create a great moral obstacle to the continuance and progress of our Faith.

I could add many more reasons, which make the conviction in my mind strong, and not easily to be shaken, but for my present purpose this is enough. That purpose being respectfully to declare that so far as I am concerned, though I suppose that concern will be estimated perhaps, as it deserves, as not very great, I can not contemplate the future prospects of the American church without most painful apprehension; that I humbly conceive proper measures have not been taken to prevent the evils which I dread, and that having no other power

> but that of declaring my impression, I am anxious to relieve myself from all responsibility for the consequence by making this plain but painful declaration to you.[44]

Apparently, no letters came from the Charleston prelate after this date. He was not the only suffragan of Baltimore who realized that Maréchal would stubbornly fight against the convocation of a Provincial Synod until his death. All that could be done was to wait in charity for that event.

---

[44]BCA—Case 16—K25. "For the private virtues and learnings of Archbishop Maréchal I cherish affectionate and respectful recollection. But if he did his duty as an Archbishop, I entertain the most erroneous notions of the situation."—England to Bruté, June 4, 1828 (Catholic Archives of America). In this same letter Bishop England expresses the opinion that perhaps after all it would be better not to unite the suffragans, since it was evident to many at the time that the South and North would eventually separate, and "that in such an event there should not exist too strong a bond to unite Churches which ought to sever. In plain practice, at present, every American Diocess is a Popedom, and Archbishop is a useless name."

CHAPTER XXII

The First Provincial Council of Baltimore (1829)

Whatever hope there may have been of a National Council was given up about this time. It was evident to all about him in Baltimore that the archbishop was too weakened by fatigue and by illness to continue the arduous duties of administration. On April 6, 1827, Maréchal wrote to Propaganda that he had caught a severe cold after administering the Sacrament of Confirmation in a country church, and that he was suffering badly from an attack of asthma. "While I was confined to my bed", he writes, "I often reflected, if in His supreme mercy, God were to call me to Himself from this life, upon the widowed state of my See and on the dangers which might occur here." He decided that, once he was well again, he would write to the Holy See to ask for the appointment of a coadjutor. Months passed; his illness grew worse; and on October 1, 1827, he wrote to Rome saying that the state of his health was so precarious that he wished a coadjutor to be appointed. His first choice was Father James Whitfield, then Vicar-General of the Archdiocese and Rector of the Cathedral. "He is a priest distinguished by his tender piety, his zeal, his sympathetic eloquence, his justness of judgment, and above all by his love for the Church and Church discipline."

Whitfield was then fifty-seven years old. The two names added to that of Whitfield were Samuel Eccleston and Michael Wheeler. Both these priests were American-born, and both had been sent by Maréchal to the Sulpicians in Paris to finish their studies. "*Je serois très embarrassé de faire un choix*", Maréchal writes. Eccleston, he says, was more prudent than Wheeler, but Wheeler was more zealous and active. They were both rather young to be selected, being twenty-six and twenty-seven respectively. On October 15, 1827, Maréchal wrote again, asking the Holy See to appoint a coadjutor without delay, this time making it clear that he preferred

Father Whitfield. The best physicians of Baltimore assured him that the asthma had attacked his heart and that there was no remedy. There is a pathetic phrase in the letter . . . "*Utinam Bulla ejus nominationis ad me perveniat, quantum fieri potest, citissime, ut antequam moriar, possim ejus consecrationis sanctam caeremoniam perficere et ejus pastorali sollicitudini dilectissimam meam sponsam committere!*"

Dr. Gradwell knew Father Whitfield personally during the time the latter lived at Crosby Hall, England, and was therefore able to corroborate Maréchal's opinion of his successor. The fact that Whitfield was an Englishman was mentioned as a favorable factor towards his nomination, since his choice ought not to arouse jealousy among the Irish, French and American groups in the American clergy. Moreover, prudence suggested that since Whitfield had been for a time a student at Stonyhurst, his election would be pleasing to the Jesuits in the United States.

At a general session of the Sacred Congregation, held on December 17, 1827, James Whitfield was elected coadjutor-Archbishop with the right of succession. A document attached to the *Atti* for this meeting gives as reason for his selection: "*1° perchè è ynglese*; *2° è bene affetto dei PP. S.J. e dei Sulpiciani*". It would appear that Father William Matthews of St. Patrick's Church, Washington, was also considered by Propaganda, and that, after the decision was taken, the old question of creating a bishopric in the District of Columbia was canvassed by the Cardinals.

Archbishop Maréchal began to sink rapidly about the time this choice was made in Rome, and died on January 29, 1828. The *Miscellany* carried the news of his death in the issue of February 9, 1828, but the eulogy it contains is copied from the Baltimore *American*. Nothing more is said until the Third Georgia Convention, held at Augusta, April 17, 1828, when Bishop England expressed the following sentiment:

> Since we last met, it has pleased God to call from his labours and earthly station, the most Rev. Ambrose Maréchal, late Archbishop of Baltimore. The peculiar mode of administration which he followed in his elevated and responsible place, created, it is true, no very peculiar bond between him and us; but still he had been during a few years previous to July, 1820,

the ordinary pastor of this State; and to the day of his death, he was our Metropolitan; added to this, he was eminently gifted with talent, most extensively read, deeply erudite, and of uncontaminated virtue; sound in his Faith, and pure in his morality: let him not be soon forgotten at those altars where already the immaculate lamb has been offered on his behalf. Though not regularly informed of the fact, I have sufficient reason to know that his place has been filled by that appointment, which probably, under all circumstances, was the best and most prudent, and that we shall soon behold at the head of our province, a venerable clergyman, who, during many years has been the confidential friend and prudent adviser of the deceased Archbishop. It would not be correct nor becoming in me to speak the eulogy of the living; but we ought to beseech our Heavenly Father to bestow upon him those rich graces which his dangerous and dignified station requires.[1]

Again, in the issue for May 3, 1828, in announcing Archbishop Whitfield's consecration, Dr. England writes:

In ecclesiastical rank Baltimore is the first amongst our churches, and if circumstances permitted the Bishops of the Province to co-operate and to act as a body, having one object in view, the relations of the Archbishop would indeed be more extensive and important than they have been since the days of Archbishop Carroll; he was enabled to hold one or more Synods, and the Prelates, we believe, felt that they were benefited by common counsel. We have more than once heard Archbishop Maréchal pathetically deplore the impossibility of his assembling his suffragans; though we have learned that they would have assembled had he been able to designate a time and place for the purpose. Should the present Archbishop during the period of his administration find those obstacles removed which stood in the way of his predecessor, we are inclined to think that he would gladly avail himself of the opportunity of again making our Province an united body under his superintendence, rather than permitting it to continue a disjointed collection of isolated Diocesses, the prelates of which are bound together only in Faith and in affection.

Whether he shall or not find it practicable to give to the Catholic Church of America form and symmetry, we expect much from the zeal of the good Prelate, and whilst our humble prayers are offered for his ministerial success and personal sanctification, we tender to him our best wishes, and congratulate his flock upon his appointment.[2]

[1] *Cath. Misc.*, vol. VII, p. 334.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 342.

James Whitfield was born at Liverpool, England, on November 3, 1770, his father being a well-to-do merchant of that city. On his father's demise in 1787, Mrs. Whitfield and her son travelled through Europe, and James spent a few years at Livorno in a business capacity. On attempting to return to England, he was made a prisoner at Lyons by Bonaparte's government. Here he met Maréchal who was teaching in the Seminary. Maréchal's direction led him to study for the priesthood, and he was ordained in 1809 in Lyons. After his mother's death, Whitfield returned to England, and was given the mission at Crosby Hall. After Maréchal's election to the See of Baltimore, Father Whitfield came to the United States (September, 1817), and was appointed Assistant Rector of the Baltimore Cathedral by his friend. Whitfield was one of the four chosen by Maréchal for the honorary doctorate in theology in 1822. A man of culture and of considerable wealth, James Whitfield was easily one of the foremost citizens of Baltimore during the decade of years which intervened before his election as archbishop.

A few days before Maréchal's death, Pope Leo XII confirmed the action of Propaganda and the decree was despatched (January 19, 1828) to "Paulo" Whitfield appointing him coadjutor with the title: Bishop of Apollonia.[3]

On February 12, 1828, Father Whitfield, as Administrator of the Archdiocese, sent the following circular to the clergy of the Archdiocese:

> The See of Baltimore is now vacant, and will continue so, until the Sovereign Pontiff appoints a successor. You are well aware how important it is for the prosperity of Religion in the U. States, that the choice of his Holiness may fall on a person adorned with all the eminent virtues which the sublime and awful office requires. In the primitive ages of Christianity, days of fasting and public prayers were appointed to obtain from the divine mercy that most important blessing. In compliance with this spirit of the Church, it is the earnest desire of the Rev. Tessier, co-administrator of the Diocess, and myself, that on every Sunday after the reading of the Gospel, you will recite, at the head of your Congregation, the 20th Psalm "ad te levavi oculos meos in montes", the hymn "Veni Creator

[3]Prop. Arch., *Lettere*, vol. 309, fol. 34.

Spiritus", vers. "Emitte Spiritum tuum et creabuntur", "Adjutorium nostrum" and with the following prayers: "Deus qui corda fidelium", & "Concede quaesumus", to the Holy Mother of God, Patroness of this Diocess; until the appointment of the Holy See be made known.[4]

On March 29, 1828, Propaganda wrote to Whitfield giving him the title: Archbishop of Baltimore, and expressing the great sorrow of the Sacred Congregation at Maréchal's passing. The title "Bishop of Apollonia" was dropped, and Whitfield was to be consecrated Archbishop of the See. He was also to continue Maréchal's task as administrator of the vacant See of Richmond.

Whitfield's consecration took place on May 25, 1828, the consecrating prelates being Flaget, Conwell, and Dubois. The sermon was delivered by Father Samuel Eccleston, who was to become his successor six years later. It is evident from one of Dr. England's letters (June 2, 1828) that the three prelates who were not of the Maréchal party in the Church (Fenwick of Cincinnati, Fenwick of Boston, and England) were not invited to the consecration. Dr. England writes:

> I have just this moment received your favor of the 27th ultimo in which you inform me that you have been consecrated Archbishop of Baltimore by the venerable senior suffragan of this province etc., aided by the two nearest Bishops (of New York and Philadelphia). I had already learned by rumour that your appointment had taken place and that with a delicacy of feeling and a correctness of principle which perfectly accord with the ancient institutions of the Church, you had invited the Bishop of Bardstown to be the consecrator. I beg leave, Most Reverend Sir, to assure you that no person in the province over which you are canonically and properly appointed to preside feels more respect for your station or a more lively interest in your welfare nor a more safe disposition to give his feeble aid to uphold the dignity and efficiency of your administration, as no one more fully appreciates your private virtues than I do.
>
> You must however allow me to express my disappointment that a communication which to us was of so much importance should have been so long withheld from my brethren of Boston, of Cincinnati, and myself. I feel it the more deeply as it was always in those provinces in which I dwelt, considered what I now feel was not intended by you, a mark of unfriendly feeling

[4]BCA—Case 23A—R1.

to any suffragan to exclude his attendance from the consecration of his Metropolitan. In this particular case it greatly mortified me to be debarred the opportunity of meeting the good man whom I look upon as the Patriarch of our Church (Doctor Flaget). I should be very far from expecting you to pay my expenses. On a former occasion I paid them myself as I always knew them to be borne by the Bishop who attended. I was prepared and would have cheerfully gone, did I not consider want of invitation to be exclusion.

My clergy, Most Reverend Sir, at present are few, but thank God they are efficient and well conducted. I have already apprised them of your appointment and be assured that their prayers and mine will be offered for you to our common Father.

On my part, Most Reverend Sir, there exists every disposition to conform my mind to that of my brethren but until we have an opportunity of taking common counsel and communicating our sentiments to each other, it is impossible for us to know in special cases what that *one mind is.* I have written on this subject more fully to my older brother of Bardstown in the hope that he would communicate to you those sentiments which at that time the peculiarity of our relation prevented my communicating directly to you. Through him I suppose you to be aware of my wishes of a synod. Of one circumstance I wish you to be assured, that I have no private wish to gratify, no private object to obtain; no effort shall ever be made by me by cabal or intrigue to make a party, and I shall submit my opinion to the judgment of the majority of my Brethren. But I am distinctly of opinion that we are every day increasing the evils of our state by avoiding to have no recourse to that mode which the disorder and experience of ages has established as the best remedy for the evils of a province—Frequent Synods.

I have then, Most Reverend Sir, referred you to my venerable Brother of Bardstown for a fuller view of my reasons and I shall not for the present press them farther. I pray God to preserve and bless you many years.[5]

It would be a valuable page in the history of canonical legislation in this country to know what finally induced Archbishop Whitfield

---

[5]BCA—Case 23—G1. In a letter to Dr. Bruté (June 4, 1828), he says: "Though I had my arrangements made and my money ready, I got what the Irish call 'a hint that I was not welcome'. I never knew before an instance of a metropolitan omitting to invite a suffragan to his consecration... These things are new to me... If I was a priest I could get leave of absence and go without an invitation. But a bishop must observe the maxim: *Nemo accedat nisi invitatus.*"

to call the First Provincial Synod of 1829. On December 18, 1828, he wrote to all his suffragans calling for the Council to meet on October 1, 1829, in case the suggestion met with the approval of the bishops. "*Praesules Archiepiscopi votis laeti et alacres annuere*", reads the official digest of the Council.[6] Dr. England's reply is dated December 26:

> I have just received your favour of the 18th, and whilst I pray that God may give to you very many returns of the present festivity, I beg of you to feel assured of my hearty thanks and respect for giving to me at length a prospect of the dawn of our prosperity.
>
> I am one of those whose expectations of benefit from our first Synod are extremely moderate, I do not calculate upon much being done in the way of legislation or of execution. Neither have I any important matter to propose nor am I ambitious of being the propounder of any measure myself, but a variety of questions will arise and a number of suggestions will be made, several of them probably by Priests, upon which we shall have to decide, although upon a principle of prudence I think our decisions at first should be made as few as possible, for it is easier to supply at a future period what might be wanting than to retract what would have been once done.
>
> *First.* I would suggest as matters for previous consideration at present: The best mode of proceeding and educating candidates for the ministry. This would involve several topics. Such as the propriety of calling on the laity for their aid, and the mode of so procuring it as to guard against too great and mischievous an interference on their parts. The propriety and practicability of having a common College, besides our Diocesan Seminaries. The mode of guarding against the admission of unworthy subjects either in orders or candidates, or those who go from Diocess to Diocess. The course of studies best adapted to our Provinces, and a great number of lesser details.
>
> *Second.* The best mode of counteracting the pernicious influence of our adversaries, in their publications, schools, and societies directed against us.
>
> *Third.* The best mode of regulating the instruction of our youth and determining how we could best procure for them the most extended course of solid religious instruction.
>
> *Fourth.* The best mode of encouraging and supporting es-

---

[6]Cf. *Concilia Provincialia Baltimore habita ab anno 1829 usque ad annum 1849*, p. 33. Baltimore, 1851. A spirited plea for the Council was made by Dr. England in a letter to the Vicar-General, Dr. Tessier, on June 27, 1828 (Catholic Archives of America, University of Notre Dame).

tablishments of such religious societies, especially females, as would best serve for the wants of our people.

Fifth. The best mode of securing under due superintendence the publication, sale and distribution of books of doctrine and piety.

Sixth. The laying down of general principles of discipline upon which we might enact our respective Diocesan Statutes with as much of an approach to uniformity as possible.

There are several other topics which might well demand our attention but I look upon these to be amongst the first which should be considered, and, as I remarked before, I do not expect at our first Synod to have much finally done upon any of them except the last. But we will know each other, be more conversant with the views of each other, benefit mutually each by the knowledge of the other, and having more friendly intercourse and more perfect confidence in each other, be more united and better prepared at our second meeting to do considerably more than we can at our first.

I most heartily approve and earnestly request to have Doctor Rosati, and Doctor Portier invited. Your province, if I mistake not, comprises Mississippi and Alabama, it assuredly takes Indiana in its range, and unless some special exception, of which I am ignorant, has been granted to them, they are by reason of those territories called upon to attend.[7]

Dr. England had expressed his hope publicly in the *Miscellany* (October 18, 1828) that Whitfield would begin his episcopate by enabling his brethren to act in concert and harmony, "after having taken common counsel". To the new archbishop's zeal, he recommended the revival "of that system of regulation of energy and of union, which it was too early to expect in the period of Archbishop Carroll's administration, but which for reasons which we suppose must have been sufficient and powerful his two immediate successors have left to Doctor Whitfield to confer." At the Sixth South Carolina Convention (November, 1828), Dr. England addressed the delegates, cleric and lay, and expressed his satisfaction that a Provincial Synod would soon be called:

The zealous manner in which our Archbishop has commenced his laborious and apostolical career leads to the hope that he will speedily find the means of gratifying the just expectations of several of our prelates by assembling our Provincial Synod, so that by our joint counsel, and united labours, we might find

[7]BCA—Case 23—G2.

light, consolation, encouragement and strength to persevere with better prospects of success in our several stations for building up the house of the living God with those materials which now lie disjointed and scattered over the surface of our States.[8]

Dr. England announced the coming Synod in the *Miscellany* (December 27, 1828) in these words:

> We congratulate the Roman Catholic Church of the United States on the prospect which now opens of its organization. Hitherto, although the Prelates were united in the same faith, and bound together in affection & in deep interest for their common charge, still they were in a manner estranged by distance, and distracted in their divided efforts. Archbishop Carroll, who better than most others knew and loved the American church, of which he might be considered the father, had devised with his first suffragans the system of regular Provincial Synods; but since his death there has been no such assembly. To Archbishop Whitfield, then, our successors will owe the benefits which must accrue from the revival, or rather the completion and the execution of the plan. He has given notice of his intention to call the first of those assemblies which are so beneficial to the interests of the church, and in order to afford sufficient time and opportunity for the Bishops to prepare their minds and materials, we understand that he is likely to fix upon the month of next October for the Session of this body, in the city of Baltimore.

The letter of December 26, 1828, received a friendly answer from the Archbishop dated Baltimore, January 4, 1829:

> I have received your kind letter of the 26th of December. I shall pay particular attention to the proposition you have laid down with regard to the Provincial Synod. As yet, no answer has reached me from any of the other Bishops. It seems quite impossible to assemble the Synod for April or the Spring; the Easter time will detain the Prelates at home and generally they would require more time to prepare their minds for so important an event, as may be, the future Synod. If you be resolved on paying a visit to Europe I think, as you do, it would be best to go as soon as possible; thus you may have sufficient time to remain there and be able to return here before the meeting will take place. I do not think it could be deferred beyond the 15th of October. The long journey to be performed by the Western Bishops would prevent their coming

[8] *Cath. Misc.*, vol. VIII, p. 153.

at all, were we even to propose a later day, for even then we shall soon enter upon winter. The 1st of October, I am sure, would be more agreeable and convenient for the majority but if you go and cannot return before the 15th, they will no doubt willingly, as I shall advise them to, fix upon the 15th. If on your way to Europe, you come through Baltimore, I shall be very glad to see you, and in good health and spirits.[9]

Dr. England decided to postpone his visit to Europe.[10] Two political events occurred at this time, which were to have far-reaching national and international results: Andrew Jackson became President of the United States on March 4, 1829, a new era opened in American affairs, and with it the awakening of the common man to new influences in national affairs; and on April 13, 1829, the Catholic Emancipation Bill passed Parliament and received the King's signature.[11]

The English and Irish papers carried the story in April, 1829, of Dr. England's transfer from Charleston to Ossory in Ireland. When this news reached Charleston, Dr. England admitted that more than once in the nine years of his episcopate he had been asked to consider vacant Sees in Ireland, but that he uniformly declined to stand for these places. The same request had been made from Sees in the United States, but he had declined to consider a change within the Province of Baltimore.[12]

The archbishop's correspondence with his suffragans and his consultations with the professors at St. Mary's Seminary resulted in considerable preparation for the work of the Council itself. The Baltimore Cathedral Archives contain a summary of these preliminary considerations. It was decided that the Council should be held in the sanctuary of the cathedral, that one promoter (a bishop) should be appointed, and one secretary, who might be a priest. There were to be two kinds of assemblies, one to be called the *preparatory conferences* to be held at the Archbishop's house, and the other the *formal sessions,* to be held in the cathedral. While in session, the Council would neither receive nor answer

---

[9]BCA—Case 23—V4.

[10]England to Whitfield, Charleston, Jan. 15, 1829 (BCA—Case 23—G3).

[11]An interesting page might be written on the gradual cessation in the United States of such societies as the Friends of Irish Freedom after this date. Cf. *Cath Misc.*, for 1829-1830.

[12]Cf. *Cath. Misc.*, vol. VIII, p. 342.

any written communications from any individual or individuals not members of the assembly. Father Matthews, as Administrator-Apostolic, was to have a decisive vote, and the procurators of absent bishops were to have the same right, with the consent of the Council. The Council was not to last more than three or four days, or a week at most, unless very urgent business should arise. The Diocesan Synod of 1791, held under Bishop Carroll, was then examined in detail and certain changes were decided upon in order to meet present necessities. The articles of the Meeting of the hierarchy, held in 1810, were examined and among the changes made was that which ended the privilege of priests who had faculties in one diocese, using these in a neighboring diocese. Some of the 1810 decrees were to be kept, others were to be examined in the Council. Under the heading *De Tractandis in Conciliis*, three main divisions of the matters to be discussed are given: (1) *De Fide et Disciplina;* (2) *De Sacramentis;* (3) *De Moribus Clericorum.*[13]

On the last day of September, 1829, the prelates assembled at the Archbishop's house.[14] There were present: Archbishop Whitfield, Bishops Flaget, England, Edward Fenwick, O.P., Joseph Rosati, C.M., Benedict Fenwick, S.J., and the Very Rev. William Matthews, Vicar General Apostolic of Philadelphia. Whitfield was then 59 years of age; Flaget, 66; England, 43; the Dominican Fenwick, 61; Rosati, 40; the Jesuit Fenwick, 47; and Matthews, 57. Flaget was the oldest bishop in point of service, having been consecrated in 1810. England was the next oldest (1820), and then followed in order of seniority the Dominican Fenwick (1822), Rosati (1824), and the Jesuit Fenwick (1825). Bishops Dubois and Portier were abroad at the time. Bishop David, who was then in his sixty-ninth year and had been consecrated ten years, was unable to be present, on account of illness.[15] Bishop Conwell, who had been called to

[13]BCA—Case 23A—T3.

[14]Dr. England arrived in Baltimore a week before the opening of the Council and took advantage of his leisure to visit Mount St. Mary's College, at Emmitsburg, on September 22. A public reception was tendered to him by the students, and Francis B. Sumter, of Charleston, welcomed his Bishop in the name of the college (*Cath. Misc.*, vol. IX, p. 118). On his return to Baltimore, Dr. England was waited upon by a delegation of prominent Catholics of the city at Mr. Barry's house, where he was stopping, and was presented with a set of episcopal vestments and an illuminated address.

[15]David to Whitfield, Bardstown, Sept. 5, 1829 (BCA—Case 23—M5, printed

Rome in 1828, had returned when he heard that the Council was called, but the prelates refused to recognize his right to sit in their assembly.[16]

At this first session certain rules were agreed upon:

1. Nothing would be sanctioned by the Council which could not be easily carried into execution.
2. No decree would be binding upon the faithful until the Holy See had given its approval.
3. Nothing would be brought before the consideration of the Fathers of the Council for decision apart from the questions which were settled upon in advance, unless by a two-thirds' vote permission were obtained.
4. The sessions would begin at ten in the morning; the private conferences at four in the afternoon. Neither were to exceed three hours' duration.

Bishop Fenwick of Boston was elected Promoter of the Council, and Father Edward Damphoux, S.S., Secretary, with Father Francis P. Kenrick as Assistant-Secretary. Father John J. Chanche was made Master of Ceremonies, and Fathers Lhomme and Radanne were chosen as Chanters. Besides these, certain prominent ecclesiastics were invited to attend: Father Francis Dzierozynski, Superior of the Jesuits in the United States; Father Joseph Carrière, the Visitator of the Sulpicians; Father John Tessier, Vicar-General of the Archdiocese of Baltimore and Dean of the Faculty of Sacred

---

in Fox, *Life of Bishop David*, pp. 123-124. New York, 1926). On learning of Bishop Dubois' departure for Europe, Dr. England wrote in the *Cath. Misc.* (October 10, 1829): "We are at a loss to account for the sudden and unexpected departure of the Bishop of New York for Europe, at the very moment when he was expected to attend the Council." Herbermann, in his biographical sketch of Dubois (*Hist. Records and Studies*, vol. I, p. 318), states that the Bishop of New York might have postponed his voyage, in order to be present at the Council, had not a letter from the Cardinal-Prefect urged him to come to Rome at once. This letter has not been found in the Propaganda Archives, and the suspicion remains that Dubois feared questioning on the troubled state of his diocese. Dubois sailed on September 20, 1829.

[16] "The Bishop of Philadelphia arrived unexpectedly yesterday or the day before. I am told that he does not claim a seat. He has had a long conference with the Prelates after the congregation last night at the Archbishop's residence ..... he does not go to the meetings, though on all occasions he is very much with his brethren."—*Cath. Misc.*, vol. IX, p. 135 (October 7, 1829). Cf. Kirlin, *Catholicity in Philadelphia*, p. 264. "One of the curious surprises for the prelates was the appearance on October 1, of two Mexican clerics with proper credentials for ordination! Who would have believed it fifty years ago? That from Mexico, where now there is no Bishop, they should be sending hither where there was then no Bishop, to have their subjects ordained" (*Cath. Misc.*, vol. IX, p. 118).

Sciences in St. Mary's Seminary; Father Louis Deluol, President of St. Mary's University; and the following Theologians specially chosen by the hierarchy, Francis P. Kenrick, Simon Bruté, De Barth, Jeanjean, Blanc, and Michael Wheeler.

The first public session was held on October 3, 1829, and meetings were held from that day until October 18.[17] On October 5, Father John Power, Vicar General of New York, was admitted to the Council as the representative of Bishop Dubois. Pontifical Mass was celebrated each day and one of the Bishops preached. At the eighth conference it was decided to write a *Ceremonial* for the Church in this country, and Dr. England was assigned to prepare the same.[18] At the ninth public session (October 13), Roger B. Taney (the future successor to Chief Justice Marshall) John Scott and William G. Read were invited to attend the deliberations, to assist in the legal question of the incorporation of Church property and ecclesiastical censures. On October 15, a letter written by Bishop Flaget was voted, thanking the Society for the Propagation of the Faith of Lyons for its generous assistance to the American Church. That same day it was voted to reprint the decrees of the Diocesan Synod of 1791. On the 17th, the *Pastoral Letter to the Faithful*, written by Dr. England, was read in committee and ordered to be given to the printer. The final session was held on October 18. Solemn Pontifical Mass was celebrated by Archbishop Whitfield, and Dr. England preached the sermon. Then came the closing prayers and the *acclamationes*. On October 24, the decrees and minutes of the Council were sent to Pope Pius VIII, with a letter signed by the prelates. It is in this letter that the oft-quoted passage occurs:

> Not two centuries have elapsed since, in a remote and obscure corner of Maryland, a little band of Catholics guided by a few missionaries, exiles from their native land, flying from the cruel persecution inflicted on them for adhering to the faith of their forefathers, laid the foundations of this American Church. It is scarcely forty years since this body of the faithful in the United States of America was found sufficient to demand in the opinion of the Sovereign Pontiff the erection of

[17]On Sunday, October 4, Archbishop Whitfield received the pallium.

[18]*The Ceremonial for the Use of the Catholic Church in the United States of America etc.* was eventually compiled by Bishop Rosati, and received the approval of Gregory XVI, on January 19, 1841.

the first episcopal see at Baltimore. Not twenty years have rolled by since a decree of the Holy Pontiff, Pius VII, exalted the Church of Baltimore with the dignity and rights of a Metropolitan, and like a joyful mother of children she has beheld in recently erected suffragan dioceses, quickened by a heaven-bestowed fruitfulness, an offspring in new churches, which it has borne to Christ. Nevertheless we see so many blessings bestowed by God on these rising churches, such increase given to this vineyard, that those who planted, and those who watered, and those who harvested and tread the overflowing winepress, are compelled to confess and admire wholly "the finger of God." The number of the faithful increases daily, churches not unworthy of Divine worship are everywhere erected, the word of God is preached everywhere and not without fruit; the hatred and prejudice spread against the Church and the faithful vanish; holy religion, once despised and held in contempt, receives honor from her very enemies; the priests of Christ are venerated even by those without; the truth and divinity of our faith is proclaimed and vindicated from the calumny of heresy and unbelief not only in churches and from pulpits, but from the press in widely scattered periodicals and books. Six ecclesiastical seminaries, the hope of our churches, have already been established, and are governed in holy discipline by pious and learned priests; nine colleges under ecclesiastical control, the glory of the Catholic name, have been erected in different States to train boys and young men in piety, arts, and higher branches of science; three of these have been chartered as universities by the legislatures; thirty-three monasteries and houses of religious women of different orders and congregations, Ursulines, Visitandines, Carmelites, Sacred Heart, Sisters of Charity, Loretto, etc., are everywhere established in our dioceses, whence emanate not only the observance of the evangelical counsels, and the exercise of all other virtues, but "the good odor of Christ" in the pious training of innumerable girls; houses of religious of the Order of Preachers and the Society of Jesus, of secular priests of the Congregation of the Mission, and of St. Sulpice, from which as centres priests are sent out to missions; many schools where the poor of both sexes are taught gratuitously; hospitals where these examples of Christian charity were formerly unknown, are now daily given by religious women to the great benefit of souls and of religion. These, Most Holy Father, are the signal benefits which God has bestowed upon us within a few years.

On Tuesday, October 20, the prelates went in a body to Dough-

oregan Manor to pay their respects to Charles Carroll of Carrollton.

The decrees (thirty-eight in number) can be divided into two classes: those based upon the Diocesan Synod of 1791 and the Agreement of 1810, but modified as the changed times and customs had suggested; and those which grew out of the problems which had arisen in American Church affairs since Carroll's death (1815-1829). Of these decrees, some were of supremely constructive value.

The *first*, *second*, and *third* decrees regulated the canonical jurisdiction of the bishop over the priests belonging to his diocese and prevented the removal of religious without the consent of the Ordinary; without, however, derogating from the privileges already granted to the Religious Orders and Congregations. The Church here had suffered considerably in discipline from the freedom with which priests had been migrating freely from one part of the country to the other, and from the action of Religious Superiors who removed their subjects at will from places where priests were badly needed. The creation of a mutual recognition of rights and privileges between the bishops and the Secular clergy on the one hand and the Religious Orders on the other had been from the sixteenth century a grave problem in English-speaking countries and was not settled until Cardinal Vaughan decided that a definite settlement was needed for Church discipline. The Bull *Romanos Pontifices* (May 8, 1881) brought this century-old question to an end.[19] That the Council of 1829 had not settled the problems for the United States is evident from Cardinal McCloskey's letter to Herbert Vaughan (November 5, 1880), stating that the settlement of the question was of the highest importance to the peace of the American Church.

The *fifth* decree laid down the rule that, owing to the abuses of lay trusteeship, no church should be erected in future without being legally assigned to the bishop, wherever possible. This decree was not to be interpreted as meaning in any way to affect the diocese of Charleston, where Dr. England had incorporated his churches under a Constitution with vestrymen legally chosen for

[19]Snead-Cox, *Life of Cardinal Vaughan*, ch. XIV (*Bishops and Regulars*). London, 1912.

that purpose.[20] Trustees were denied the *jus patronatus*, and henceforth were never to exercise the right of appointing or dismissing their pastors. It is interesting to note that, when this decree was discussed in Rome before approval, the Sacred Congregation suggested that it read: "No right of patronage of what kind soever exists *up to this time* in this country." These words were not accepted by the Fathers of the Council, and so the suggested word: *Hactenus,* will not be found in the decree, but a compromise was made by changing the decree to read: "No right of patronage . . . *now* exists in this country."

The *ninth* decree read originally to the effect that the Douay Version of the Holy Scriptures was to be used, *since it had the approval of the Holy See.* This clause was ordered to be stricken out, since the Holy See had not done so.[21] The *thirty-fourth* decree on the necessity of erecting Catholic elementary schools was passed without comment by the Sacred Congregation. The final decree (38) ordered the next Provincial Synod to be held within three years "*nisi gravi de causa Archiepiscopus videatur illud ultra differre.*"

John England was satisfied, but not entirely so, with the results of this first meeting of the hierarchy in nearly twenty years.[22] He

[20]"*Hoc tamen Decreto nihil innovare volumus in ea ratione agendi quam in sua Dioecesi Episcopus Carolopolitanus jam servat.*" For the bearing of this decree upon the property controversy between the Society of Jesus and the Archbishops of Baltimore, cf. Hughes, *Hist. Soc. Jesus,* Doc., vol. I, pt. 2, pp. 464, 516, 517, 525; Pt. II, p. 1134. Hughes states (*ibid.*, p. 1134, note 5) that "while the Maréchal controversy was at its height (1824), Bishop England wrote for the said *Annals* (of Lyons) a passage which implies that the Maryland Jesuits had appropriated lands not intended for them." The passage to which Hughes refers was written in September, 1836, and contains no such implication [*Works* (Reynolds), vol. III, p. 239]. Dr. England studiously avoided all reference in his writings to the Maréchal-Jesuit controversy.

[21]The only version of the Bible which has been declared authentic by the Holy See is the Vulgate of St. Jerome as revised during the Pontificate of Clement VIII (1598). Some translations into modern tongues have been approved by the hierarchies of different countries. In the case of the popular Italian version by Archbishop Antonio Martini, of Florence, papal approval was given by Pius VI (1778). This Brief, which highly praises the reading of the Bible in the vernacular, was printed in the preface to the Douay version published at Birmingham in 1815, and will be found also in later editions. Pius VI did not give a general approval to versions in the vernacular, but the insertion of the Brief to Archbishop Martini gave rise to the false conclusion that the Douay version had papal approval. Hence the change in the ninth decree of the Council.

[22]Bishop England sent letters daily to the *Catholic Miscellany.* These appeared in October-November, 1829, and are the only contemporary history we have of the Council.

had expressed himself to the archbishop, as we have seen, as quite moderate in his hopes. To Judge Gaston, he wrote on November 7, 1829: "The Council has done much in the way of regulation, of discipline, for the clergy, but very little else."[23] At the Fifth Georgia Convention (April, 1830), he said to the delegates:

> One important event, however, has occurred since our last meeting in this state. A provincial synod has been assembled in our ecclesiastical metropolis, and a considerable share of business has been done. When our venerable Archbishop summoned the assembly, and indeed I might say, at the very period of opening the session, no one of us ventured to hope for more than the formation of a more intimate acquaintance between prelates, few of whom had previously met—and the obtaining more accurate knowledge of the state of our national Church, by learning from each other those details which are better calculated to create that knowledge than any general description whatever. We trusted that in this way a foundation would be laid for the subsequent beneficial proceedings of our hierarchy, and that our subsequent meeting would be one of business. However, we soon perceived that, upon several important topics, there was an extraordinary coincidence of judgment, the result of full examination and mature reflection: several regulations respecting the discipline of the clergy, and the concerns of our churches, were accordingly framed and transmitted to the Holy See for its approval. The decision of this venerable tribunal has not as yet been received.
>
> It will, I am convinced, give you great pleasure to be informed, that a more affectionate union cannot be imagined than that which reigns between all the prelates of these United States. We have, for the first time, met, natives of five different and distant Christian nations: and among the priests who assisted us, with their counsel and information, were men sprung from two other nations of Christendom, thus bringing with us the testimony, and perhaps many of the prejudices of seven regions, differing in climate, in soil, in civil government, in domestic habits, in language, and in a variety of other respects: yet not only perfectly united in the sameness of that faith which our ancestors derived from a common apostolic source, and which has now proved its unchanged character, from its identity in these and in so many other nations, in all of which it remains such as it was in the beginning; but we ourselves were in accordance in our opinions respecting the outline

[23] *Records* (ACHS), vol. XX, p. 141.

of that discipline which our peculiar circumstances in these excellent and flourishing republics demand. Our accounts from the North and the South, from the East and the West, all concur in exhibiting the progressive organization of our churches; the addition to our numbers, the extension of more correct notions respecting ourselves and our tenets amongst our fellow-citizens, brethren separated from the household of our faith. We were gladdened by the accounts of the diffusion of knowledge, the diminution of prejudice, the increase of brotherly affection, the improvement in piety and well-ordered religious zeal. To our brethren of the clergy and laity, we must look for a continuance and perfection of those cheering symptoms: the cause is that of God, and of you and your successors and descendants; we are but his instruments and your servants: our labours will be useless without your coöperation.

Beloved brethren, we have addressed to the clergy and to the laity our earnest and affectionate letters on several topics, which regard their several duties, in respect to those important concerns; and it is our pleasing hope that you have perused them with that affection which the great subject requires, and that you have fully entered into our sentiments therefrom. I would strongly recommend to you to read again and attentively, the letters of the prelates to the clergy and the laity. They will exhibit to you all the great principles and topics which should form the subjects of your consideration.[24]

The two *Pastorals* of the Council are from Dr. England's pen. The *Pastoral to the Laity* treats the following topics: The growth of the Church; loss and gain; the need of priests; Christian education; attacks on the Faith; the reading of Holy Scripture; the necessity of unity among the faithful; trusteeism; attendance at Holy Mass; and false liberalism—"that demoralizing and undesirable semblance of liberality now so prevalent, which confounds truth and error, by asserting that all religions are alike." The *Pastoral* closes with an exhortation to promote charity and affection with non-Catholics of all denominations:

To God and not to you, nor to us, do they stand or fail; to him and not to us is reserved the judgment of individuals. We know it to be clearly declared by the inspiration of heaven, as it is also manifest from the plain evidence of reason, that there cannot be now upon this earth, two true churches. We know that we have preserved the deposit of the faith, which

[24] *Works* (Reynolds), vol. IV, p. 395.

we ought to adorn by our virtue and whilst we testify those facts to you we exhort you to imitate the glorious and creditable example of those good men who first sowed the mustard seed of our faith in this part of our continent. They were so fully convinced of those great truths which we now proclaim, that they suffered joyfully every description of persecution rather than swerve from that one holy Catholic and Apostolic Church to which you and they and we belong. Yet neither the principles of that faith, nor the affliction which they endured, created any unkind feeling in their benevolent hearts; and though even at this side of the Atlantic, upon their arrival, they found persecution everywhere armed with the implements of torture, inflicting pain and death under the pretext of piety they ventured to introduce a milder, a better, a more Christian-like principle; that of genuine religious liberty, which though it declares that truth is single, that religious indifference is criminal in the eye of God, and that religious error wilfully entertained is destructive to the soul; yet also proclaims that the Saviour has not commanded his gospel to be disseminated by violence, and therefore they enacted, that within their borders, all other Christians should securely repose in the enjoyment of all their civil and political rights, though they were in religious error. If our brethren of other denominations have, since that period, adopted the principle, and now cherish it, they will not be displeased at our gratification that it emanated from the body to which we belong, and at our inculcating upon you, to preserve the same spirit that those good men manifested not only in our civil and political, but also in your social relations with your separated brethren.[25]

Owing to the great number of French Catholics in the Dioceses of New Orleans and St. Louis, this *Pastoral* was also published in that language. It was the last time such an action was taken.

The *Pastoral to the Clergy* is one of the most remarkable documents ever issued by the American hierarchy. The clergy, the light of the world, are vowed to sacerdotal perfection, perfection based upon the spirit of prayer, upon daily meditation and the reading of Holy Scripture. The necessity of preaching in season and out of season the Word of God, of constant study—"No large stock of works is requisite; a very few will answer; but those few should be in perpetual use"—is stressed, and the dignity of the priesthood

[25]Guilday, *National Pastorals etc.*, pp. 36-37.

and of clerical life is described. Much untold history lies behind the following paragraph:

> We are led from this topick to another that fills us with painful recollection. The Saviour declared woe to the world because of scandals, and also foretold that, owing to the imperfection of our nature and the evil propensities of the human race, scandals must come; but he denounced his wrath against those by whose fault these evils would arise. We trust, and are disposed to believe, reverend brethren, that few if any of you are likely to incur this malediction; yet we cannot forget that it was chiefly through the misconduct of clergymen that several occasions of lamentable schism were given in our province. How has the progress of religion been impeded! How have strife and tumult profaned the sanctuary of the God of peace! How have we been exposed to the unpleasant observations of our fellow citizens! How have our most sacred rights been thoughtlessly and criminally invaded! How has the venerable spouse of the Saviour of the World been ridiculed and insulted! How many criminal souls have been precluded from a return to mercy! How many of the wavering have been thrown back in despair! How many have been driven from the sacraments! How many of the faithful and firm have been oppressed with anguish and shame! In other days and in other nations the crimes of the clergy have caused the degradation of the Church, the contempt of the institutions of religion, sanctioned the vices of the laity, been the sources of schism, and the origin of heresy. If we look over the dark catalogue from the time of Nicholas the deacon to our own, what a frightful accumulation is presented to the eye! We would invite you to weep with us over this abomination! But what would tears avail? Let us rather call upon you to aid us in guarding our infant churches against such dreadful calamities for the time to come; and though you should feel that we ought to be convinced, as we are, of the purity of your intentions, the correctness of your demeanour, and your zeal for the glory of God, yet you will acknowledge that it is with such a clergy, and under such circumstances, that discipline can be most easily established, that will preserve and improve those dispositions and render their effects more generally beneficial. It is from men of such dispositions we can with great confidence require the cheerful adoption of those wholesome restraints of ecclesiastical laws, which are more required to prevent future evils than to remedy any that exist. It must, however, be confessed that owing to a variety of circumstances not hitherto under our control, our organiza-

> tion has not been so perfect, nor our observances so exact, as we could desire; but with your zealous co-operation we now expect to make considerable progress towards a more orderly and efficient state of being.[26]

Dr. England neglected no aspect of sacerdotal life in these pages, and the *Pastoral* stands today, as it did then, one of the clearest mirrors of priestly zeal and devotion in the English language.

The *Acta et Decreta* of the Council were acknowledged by Propaganda on February 27, 1830, and were then placed before the officials of the Sacred Congregation for examination.[27] The *Atti* for June, 1830, contain a thoroughly detailed analysis of the Council and its decrees. These had been sent to Father Kohlmann, S.J., "*acciò nella piena notizia che egli ha delle cose di America, per avervi dimorato molti anni*", and the *parere* of Kohlmann was placed before the Cardinals. Bishop Dubois of New York was also in Rome and his reflections upon the decrees were also asked. Kohlmann was in favor of the rigorous regulations regarding migratory priests, but Dubois thought these rules should be modified. Kohlmann was not satisfied with the fifth decree which regulated the erection of churches in the future, since it might infringe on the privilege of the Religious Orders. The incorporation of ecclesiastical property in the bishop of the diocese he considered a dangerous innovation, because of the possible abuse of this power—"*aliqua exempla fuerunt in Hibernia*"—by himself or by his heirs. Kohlmann also warned Propaganda not to accept the decree lest it implicitly approve Bishop England's constitutional method of Church government. Propaganda replied that the wonderful tranquillity in the Diocese of Charleston was a proof of the wisdom of its bishop.

When the changes were agreed upon, an *Instructio* was drawn up (June 28, 1830), and sent to Archbishop Whitfield on October 16, of that year, with the formal approval of the Council.[28] On December 11, 1830, Cardinal Cappellari, the Prefect of the Sacred Congregation, wrote to Archbishop Whitfield, congratulating him on the masterly way in which the Fathers of the Council had settled the difficulties threatening the peace of the Church here.

---

[26] *Ibid.*, pp. 50-51.
[27] Prop. Arch., *Lettere*, vol. 311, fol. 314.
[28] *Ibid.*, fol. 894. These documents will be found in the *Concilia habita etc.*, pp. 60-71.

The first Provincial Council laid the cornerstone of ecclesiastical discipline in this country. On all sides were heard expressions of joy over its success. The fact that bishops of different nationalities could meet and unite their efforts to create uniformity of Church law for the United States and to bring the American Church into closer union with the Holy See was a splendid encouragement to serious and devout workers in the missions and a sturdy reminder to malcontents amongst clergy and laity that the days of rebellion and disorder were passing. Had the bishops gone a step further and given the pastors a canonical status, as Dr. England earnestly urged in the private sessions of the Council, it would have brought much satisfaction to the clergy who realized their helpless position in case justice demanded an appeal to a higher ecclesiastical court. Kenrick pointed this out in unmistakable language to the Sacred Congregation on October 18, 1829. Apart from this one door left open for the entrance of further disorder, the decrees of the Council, while rigid in many respects, were productive of immeasurable good to a Church which was then on the eve of a remarkable period of progress.

CHAPTER XXIII

Catholic Education and Social Welfare

Bishop England was crippled at the time of the Council, owing to an injury he had received during the summer of 1829 in Georgia. On November 12, 1829, he left Baltimore for Washington, where he had an engagement to preach in St. Patrick's Church the following Sunday. He reached Charleston on November 23, after a journey of eight days. That same evening he addressed the delegates of the Seventh South Carolina Convention and expressed his delight over the pleasant experiences of the Council:

> Great credit is due to our excellent Metropolitan for his promptness in acceding to the requisition for calling this Council, and for the manner of his presiding, as well as his unostentatious hospitality for all who chose to indulge in the pleasure of its participation... For my own part I feel it a singular happiness to be associated with such men as were there assembled, and I must say, that I have never been more edified than by the zeal, the humility, and the religious demeanour of my brethren and their assistants, and what their information has added to my stock of knowledge, is indeed considerable. It is for us, beloved brethren, a source of great consolation to behold in our day, our Provincial Church assuming the proper form, and growing into a state of harmonious and extensive organization. Let the example not be lost upon ourselves.—We are no longer a number of jealous, scattered, contentious and badly agreeing congregations, with no point of union but a common faith: No, we are half-a-million of souls knit together into one Provincial Church, having charity for those who differ from us, and affection for each other. Our efforts are not those of individuals, nor of disjointed societies; we are members of a body in which there exists but one vivifying spirit, and which has but one rule of common action; when any one member suffers all sympathize, when one is invigorated all rejoice. Our separated brethren are united and powerful in the promotion of their special views, and in the attainment of their particular objects: they give to us excellent examples by their assiduity. Whilst we lament their departure from the original fold, we must feel that we as yet linger far behind them in our own industry.

> Even the brethren of our household of the faith in Europe exert themselves in our behalf; shall we then not be roused to bestir ourselves in our own concerns?[1]

In this same address Dr. England told the representatives, clergy and lay, who were present that one of the most pressing concerns at that moment was to provide for the proper education of the children:

> This is the parents' special obligation, and the pastors' most pressing and elevated duty, as it is also the patriot's and the charitable man's field of active and useful benevolence. As yet we have not been able to do much in its regard; our children are scarcely provided in the city with sufficient opportunities of proper religious instruction, in the country and in remote towns they are still more destitute; our orphans have fallen into the power of those by whom they are estranged from the creed of their fathers, and our little females are especially exposed. It is true that more urgent wants must be first supplied; but these concerns ought not to be forgotten.

Dr. England had given considerable thought to providing for the education of young girls. The manuscript *Annals* of the Sisters of Mercy of Charleston state that the original band of three ladies came from Baltimore to establish their religious life under Dr. England's care, in November, 1829.[2] These three ladies, Mary Joseph and Honora O'Gorman, and their niece, Teresa Barry, were natives of Cork, but for some years residents of Baltimore. Their school for girls was opened in January, 1830, not far from the bishop's house. Although we find no mention of the establishment of this diocesan community of teaching Sisters either in the *Miscellany* for 1829-30, or in his addresses before the Annual Conventions, there is mention made of them in a letter to Propaganda, dated May 21, 1830.

In May, 1830, Dr. England started on the long journey to New Orleans to assist at the consecration of Bishop-Elect De Neckere. The ceremony which was fixed for May 16, had to be postponed owing to Dr. De Neckere's illness, and Bishop England, who had also promised to preach in Bardstown at the consecration of Dr. Francis F. Kenrick, coadjutor-elect of Philadelphia, left on May 18

---

[1] *Cath. Misc.*, vol. IX, p. 178.

[2] *A Southern Teaching Order: The Sisters of Mercy of Charleston, S. C., 1829-1924*, reprinted from the *Records* (ACHS), vol. XV (Sept., 1904).

by the steamboat *Louisiana* for the northern journey up the Mississippi. On May 21, he reached Natchez, and while there dispatched to the Cardinal-Prefect of Propaganda a letter in the nature of a decennial report on the state of religion in his diocese. His letter was dated "*in itinere supra fluvium Mississippi*". Ten years ago, he writes, he accepted the Bishopric of Charleston. "I have worked the best I could", he says, "and God alone knows with what result." Five years before he had received a rebuke from the Sacred Congregation, and he insisted that the Bishop of Philadelphia was responsible for it. He praises the zeal and love of justice on the part of Propaganda, and expresses the greatest veneration for its officials and members. "But, unsupported by any friends, burdened day and night with many cares and labours in discharging my duties, oppressed with financial difficulties, and the object of your suspicions, I judged it scarcely worth the trouble to try to explain the principles upon which my diocesan organization was based, even though I have been upheld in this system by my brethren in the American Episcopate." He had intended making an *ad limina* visit to Rome, but he lacked the money for the journey. Then follows a detailed history of the diocese from 1820 to 1830. There were at this latter date 10,000 Catholics in the two Carolinas and Georgia, in a population of 1,500,000. He computed the number of fallen-away Catholics to be about 100,000.

> In Charleston four nuns are living a religious life under a rule which I drew up for them. They were established towards the end of last year under the title of Our Lady of Mercy, and they desire to take simple vows each year and to dedicate themselves to the work of teaching young girls, of instructing the negro slaves in faith and morals, and of caring for the sick and infirm.

The facts given in the *Annals* are corroborated by Dr. England's letter to Judge Gaston (February 25, 1830), in which he says: "The Sisters whom I am endeavouring to establish will not be a band of those at Emmittsburg, nor dependent on them, as I do not wish to make my institutions depend upon superiors over whom I have neither control or influence. Hence I shall try what can, within the diocess, be done upon the same principle. I have four who cost me very little and do much service."[3]

[3]Prop. Arch., *Scritt. refer., Amer. Cent.*, vol. 10, fol. 2.

The Academy of Our Lady of Mercy which the ladies opened soon became the center of the educational and social welfare work of the Catholics of Charleston. Besides day scholars, boarders were accepted, and a small number of orphans were cared for even from the beginning.

A year passed before any mention of the Sisters was made in the *Miscellany*, probably because this was the year of their probation or noviceship. In the issue of January 15, 1831, we read:

> It is now more than twelve months since a few unpretending young women have, in this city, placed themselves under the direction of the bishop in a probationary state, with the intention of devoting themselves to the service of God and of their neighbour, under the usual regulations of the church for persons of their sex and condition. They received a short rule of conduct, by the observance of which, they might be able to advance in the practices of piety and industry, and if successful, might aspire to be formed into a more permanent institute. During the course of the year several applications were made by others for permission to join them; some of the persons who thus petitioned were received, and they continued to render themselves useful. On last Sunday the four who first associated were permitted to make vows for one year, which after a retreat of several days spent in prayer and meditation, they emitted on last Sunday morning in presence of the bishop, just before communion. The prelate for this purpose celebrated Mass a little before eight o'clock at the lesser altar of the Cathedral, which is dedicated under the invocation of the Blessed Virgin Mary; and after demanding of each of the candidates, in the most solemn manner, whether the act which she was about to perform, was the result of her own free choice, without any influence of any description exercised over her will; and being answered in the affirmative, he permitted the vow to be made; after which, the person making it received the holy communion from his hand.
>
> The bishop subsequently addressed to them an instructive and pathetic exhortation respecting the obligation and advantages of the state upon which they had entered.
>
> Several other sections of the union have extensively profited during years by the example, the prayers, and the labours of their religious female institutes; this is the first effort which has been made in this Diocess, and we trust, and pray, that it may receive a blessing from the giver of every good gift. There is no section in which a society of this description is

more needed, and we rejoice in the hope which is thus given to us, that we may no longer be deprived of the advantages which result from such establishments.

Bishop England saw in his sister, Joanna Monica, who had accompanied him from Cork in 1820, the possibility of founding the first religious congregation of women for his diocese. Joanna was twenty years old at the time of her brother's consecration. Their sister, Mary, had entered the Presentation Convent, in Cork, nine years before. We know from Dr. England's letters that Joanna was attracted by the Daughters of Charity of Emmitsburg, and that he held her back, probably hoping that she should be the nucleus of a religious community in the diocese. While in Boston, at the installation of Bishop Fenwick, in December, 1825, Dr. England had asked the Ursulines of that city to send some nuns to Charleston. There is a letter in the Charleston Archives (dated February 6, 1826) from the Superioress, Mother Mary Edmund St. George, who was at the head of the Convent when it was destroyed by the Boston mob in 1834. Mother St. George wrote:

The kind attention which you manifested toward this community during your stay in Boston, was too marked not to call forth sentiments of gratitude on our part, of which I would willingly convey an expression. Accept then, my Lord, I beg of you, our heartfelt acknowledgments; as also, our sincere wishes for your happiness during the year lately commenced.

Let me now apologize for the cool reception which I gave your Lordship. When I think of it, I am quite confused; and am tempted to regret, that your visit to this quarter did not take place at some other time: for, on that occasion, I felt so sensibly the approaching departure of my sincere friend and brother in Christ, the Rev. Mr. Taylor, that it was almost impossible for me to act otherwise. Besides, Mr. Taylor told me, that I should see you alone, previous to your leaving Boston, and I promised myself to make amends for my former apparent indifference.

Be assured, my Lord, that I and my sisters take a lively interest in the success of your apostolical labours; and, earnestly pray, that the Almighty may, by his divine benediction, make them produce abundant fruit. We will beg in particular, according to your desire, that our order may be extended to Charleston.

I am joined by all in this community in presenting our

most respectful compliments to your Lordship. May we solicit the favour of a remembrance in your holy Sacrifices and prayers?

Joanna England fell a victim to one of the yellow fever epidemics, so prevalent in the South at this time, and died on October 14, 1827, in the twenty-seventh year of her age. The city went into mourning for one for whom everybody, high and low, rich and poor, Catholic and Protestant and Jew, had the warmest affection. She had always been a welcomed visitor in the best circles of the city, and probably no event in Bishop England's life brought him so close to the heart of Charleston as his sister's death. He says in a letter to Dr. Bruté (November 12, 1827): "She was a sensible companion, a great literary aid, the gentle monitor, who pointed out my faults, who checked my vanity, who taught me that what was done was the work of God and not that of the miserable and frail instrument which He used. She did more by the sacrifice of her money and of her comforts to establish the Diocese than was done by any other means I know."

The Ursuline Sisters of Boston removed to Charlestown, Massachusetts, in 1826, and evidently the work in their Academy demanded all their resources, for they were unable to found a house in Charleston, South Carolina. On his first visit to Ireland, (July, 1832), Dr. England spent several days in Cork. His sister Mary (Mother Catherine) was again Superioress of the North Presentation Convent in that city. She held that post from 1820 to 1826 and from 1829 to 1835. Dr. England reached Cork on August 18, 1832, after an absence of nearly twelve years. The manuscript annals of the Cork Convent do not state whether he asked Mother Catherine to come to Charleston. It may be that, since the Presentation Order was devoted to the elementary education of girls, he did not believe it necessary to duplicate the excellent work being accomplished by his own community, the Sisters of Mercy.[4]

While in Cork, Bishop England was the recipient of many honors from his friends of former days. The *Cork Mercantile Chronicle*, which he had directed twenty years before, speaks of him as "decidedly one of the greatest men that Ireland has produced; and one

[4]There are no letters from Bishop England to his sister in the Convent Archives.—Letter from the Superioress, Mother Ursula O'Callaghan, to the writer, Cork, Nov. 17, 1923.

of her best men. The Catholic must venerate him for his learning, piety and zeal. The lover of liberty must hail him as one of the most devoted and useful advocates of freedom in the new or old world." On August 27, 1832, a delegation of the citizens of Cork presented Dr. England with a "congratulatory address", and the *Chronicle,* in the account of the ceremony, says:

> After an interesting interview of over an hour, the Deputation returned deeply impressed with a sense of the loss which Ireland has sustained by the withdrawal of so powerful and enlightened a mind from that sphere of usefulness and patriotism at home, of which, at one time, he was the all-moving centre; and it produced in every member of the Deputation mingled feelings of sorrow and admiration, when they found that an elevated sense of religious duty, united to a cordial attachment to the people and institutions of America, had almost shut out the hope that at some future time his native country might again have the benefit of his great talents.

In replying to the address of welcome, Dr. England spoke of the three great measures for the welfare of Ireland which had been passed during his absence in America: Catholic Emancipation, Parliamentary Reform, and the National Education Act. Of America, he said:

> I do love the land of my birth with the fondness of a child; but my conduct must be regulated by the principles of a man. I could wish to dwell amongst my earliest and exceedingly kind friends; and to have my bones laid in the earth which covers those dear to me by every tie which can fasten the heart to its object. But you have well indicated the principles which command me to return to the scene of my labours, the discharge of my indispensible duty, and the society of a people to whom I would be more than ungrateful if I did not love—they have upon me, whatever may be my real or supposed utility, every claim which kind partiality, warm affections, tender solicitude, and pastoral attachment could create. Like my friends in the land of my birth, they, in the land of my adoption, have far overrated my worth, and heaped upon me favours which I can never repay. I approve and I love those institutions to which I have given the voluntary pledge of my fidelity; but though the waters may separate you and me, they shall not dampen the ardour of my affection nor wash away the remembrance of multiplied favours conferred upon one, who whilst he lives, shall treasure in his inmost heart that gratitude which no words can express.

The following day (August 28), the secular and regular clergy of the city gave him a dinner, at which Bishop Murphy of Cork presided. A transparency carried a message in Dr. England's honor:

Viro
De Religione aeque ac de libertate
Optimo Merito,
Presuli eximio, civi probo, in patriam nunc reduci, inter suos
Paulisper heu! Commoranti.
Clerus Corcagiensis has epulas sacras.
D. D. D.

Two days later "a dinner unsurpassed in point of numbers and respectability by any event held in this city on any occasion", was tendered the Bishop of Charleston by the Chamber of Commerce of Cork. It was at this gathering that Bishop Murphy announced that before long Dr. England "would be helping Irish Catholics in Ireland itself". At Bandon, where he had once been pastor, the citizens of all creeds presented him with a beautiful silver chalice. A visit to Dublin and to his old College of Carlow followed. Bishop England then left for Rome, reaching the Eternal City on Christmas Day, 1832. The news of the death (November 14, 1832) of Charles Carroll of Carrollton, the last of the Signers of the Declaration of Independence, had reached Rome at that time and caused considerable sorrow among the Americans who resided there. It was suggested to Dr. England that a Requiem Mass be celebrated for the repose of Carroll's soul, and that he preach the eulogy. The Mass was celebrated at the Church of St. Isidore, where the Irish Franciscans lived, and was attended by all the English, Irish, Scottish and American students; among the latter were the two Indians of the Ottawa tribe who were studying for the Diocese of Cincinnati. Father Anthony Kohlmann, S.J., celebrated the Mass, assisted by Fathers Jeanjean, Secretary to the Bishop of New Orleans, and Father McSherry, S.J., of Georgetown College. The newspapers of the day reported that some parts of Dr. England's sermon were resented by an English Catholic who was present, and a distorted account of his remarks was sent to the Holy Office. An investigation took place, but nothing came of it. While in Rome, Dr. England was made an Assistant to the Papal Throne. He occupied himself for ten weeks preparing an *Explanation of the Construction, Furniture and Ornaments of a Church, of the Vestments of the Clergy,*

and of the Nature and Ceremonies of the Mass, which was translated into French and Italian, and published in the three languages at the Pope's expense.[5] This was followed immediately by his *Explanation of the Ceremonies of the Holy Week in the Chapels of the Vatican, and of Easter Sunday, in the Church of St. Peter.*[6]

During Bishop England's absence, the School for Young Ladies, under the direction of the Sisters of Mercy, had advanced sufficiently to place it among the advertisements of the *Miscellany.* The terms for tuition were one hundred dollars a year. Catholic girls were to be assembled in the Cathedral every Tuesday and Thursday to receive instruction in the Catechism, but there was to be "no interference with the religious opinions of other pupils."

After his return to Charleston (October 9, 1833), Bishop England was too much occupied with the work preparatory to the Second Provincial Council of Baltimore, which was called for October 20, and with the burdensome task of the Apostolic Delegation to Haiti, to attend much to diocesan affairs. At the close of the Council he returned to Charleston, and on December 18, sailed for the West Indies on his mission to Haiti.

During Dr. England's journey to Europe, there came to Charleston a small group of French ladies, calling themselves Dames de la Retraite, led by Madame Hery du Jarday. These ladies came first to New York, but, not obtaining any encouragement from Bishop Dubois, they settled in Philadelphia, where they opened an Academy in Chestnut Street. The advertisement for their school appears in the *Catholic Almanac* for 1833.[7] The Dames de la Retraite were founded in 1678 at Quimper in Brittany. Their houses were destroyed during the French Revolution, and one of their members is numbered among the martyrs of the Terror.[8] On their restoration

[5]Though this work (138 pp.) was published by Lucas, in Baltimore, in 1834, it was not exactly the kind of *Ceremonial* the Council of 1829 desired. For that reason, as well as on account of Bishop England's many duties in the Haitian delegation, the composition of the *Ceremonial* was given to Bishop Rosati and was issued in 1841 with the title: *Ceremonial for the use of the Catholic Churches in the United States of America, published by order of the First Council of Baltimore.* Bishop England's *Explanation* was dedicated to Cardinal Weld, who had been, as a boy, one of the acolytes at John Carroll's consecration at the family church, Lulworth Castle, in 1790.

[6]This volume (131 pp.) is dedicated to Henry Englefield, then resident in Rome.

[7]*Records* (ACHS), vol. XXII, p. 62.

[8]Cf. Crosnier, *Une Dame de la Retraite de Quimper, martyre sous la Terreur (Victoire Conen de Saint-Luc, 1761-1794).* Paris, 1919.

in 1805, they took up the work of teaching. The advertisement for their "Young Ladies French and English Academy" in Charleston appears for the first time just before Dr. England's departure for Haiti.[9]

Madame Hery du Jarday came of her own accord, not indeed without the approval of her superiors at Quimper, to the United States; but none of the Community accompanied her, since the project did not seem a prudent one. This was equivalent to a complete separation of Madame Hery and the Quimper community. There are some interesting pages on her adventuresome and unstable character in the Quimper community annals. After causing considerable alarm to her superiors, Madame Hery left the Community in September, 1831, and set out a few months later for the United States. Her career in this country was as erratic as that during her years as a religious in France. Dr. England was so anxious to set up a house of select studies for the young Catholic girls of the city of Charleston that he gave his consent to the establishment of the Dames de la Retraite on condition that Madame Hery obtain letters from her superiors guaranteeing her rightful standing in the Community. These were not forthcoming, and on November 27, 1835, he wrote a letter of recommendation for her Community on her promise to leave the diocese. On May 6, 1836, Madame Hery wrote to the Archbishop of Bordeaux asking for permission to enter his diocese, giving as her reason for the change the persecution of the Religious Orders of women which had then begun in the United States. Evidently, no answer was received from Cardinal Cheverus. Later the Dames de la Retraite are found at St. Augustine, but there is apparently no trace of their Community after their stay in Florida.[10]

After completing his negotiations with President Boyer of Haiti, Dr. England went to Rome, to make an official report on the Haitian situation to the Holy See. Late in August, 1834, he left Rome, and

[9]"The Bishop sailed on Wednesday morning last for the *West Indies* accompanied by the Rev. Timothy Bermingham as chaplain and secretary, and Mr. Peter F. Pipard as sacristan. He previously tonsured Master James A. Corcoran, a native of Charleston, who immediately proceeded with Mr. Patrick N. Lynch, of Cheraw, S. C., but for some time past a student of the Seminary, to Rome; both to enter as students of the College *Sac. Cong. de Propaganda Fide*."—*Cath. Misc.*, vol. XIII, p. 198.

[10]These facts are taken from documents found in the Archiepiscopal Archives at Bordeaux, and from correspondence with the present mother-house in Paris.

on his arrival in Paris (September 7) he found, he says, a letter "from Mrs. Moloney, the Superior of the Ursuline colony destined to Charleston, in which I was informed that a young lady who had determined to accompany them was in Rouen the last week of August, and desired to go to Cork." We learn from the manuscript annals of the Presentation Sisters of Cork that on Saturday, September 27, Sisters M. Charles Moloney, Borgia McCarthy, and Antonia Hughes were sent from the Ursuline Convent at Blackrock to the North Presentation Convent to meet Bishop England. The following Sunday, he celebrated Mass in the Convent chapel, and immediately after breakfast the little group started for Liverpool, where they embarked on the *Pocahontas*, bound for Philadelphia. The annals contain also the following note for this month: "Dr. England had obtained from His Holiness, Pope Gregory XVIth, a Rescript, empowering him, without consulting the Ordinary (Dr. Murphy) or any other person, to transfer his Sister, Mother M. Catherine, to his Diocese in Charleston, for the purpose of establishing our Order (Presentation) there, but our Bishop objected, and Dr. England made no further movement in the matter, though that was the principal object of his visit to Ireland."[11]

The Ursuline Sisters were on their way to Charleston during the last months of 1834 when the press of the United States was filled with the controversies occasioned by the burning of the Ursuline Convent at Charlestown, Massachusetts. The news of the proposed convent reached Charleston through letters from Dr. England, and the editor of the Charleston *Observer* lost no time in calling upon the Protestants to combine against this additional element of Popery in their city. The attack was quickly hushed, for there was no wish on the part of the non-Catholic citizens to allow any member of their community to repeat the tragedy caused by the notorious Beecher of Boston. The editor of the Charleston *Observer*, a Protestant minister, thus defined a convent in his attack upon the project of Bishop England: "A Convent usually consists of a mass of buildings, where females are immured. *Single* females, young and old,

[11]The news went abroad in Europe at this time that Dr. England was shortly to be raised to the Cardinalate. The *Dublin Register* of June 1, 1834, carried an item: "We understand that the celebrated Bishop of Charleston has been appointed Cardinal by the Pope. He is the first Irishman that ever attained that dignity."

are either carried thither by force, or driven thither by disappointment or misfortune, or drawn thither by the influence of those in whom they confide." The insinuation in the definition is evident.

Bishop England and the Sisters arrived in Philadelphia on November 11, 1834. The three Ursulines, with Miss Woulfe, the postulant mentioned in one of his letters already cited, waited in Philadelphia while the Bishop remained to give a series of lectures on the principles of the Catholic religion in St. John's Church. The *Catholic Herald* of Philadelphia for November 20, speaks of the extraordinary success of the sermons and says:

> Of Dr. England's manner it is almost needless to speak. Those who have heard him do not require a description, and no description can adequately convey a just idea of his nervous eloquence to those who have not had the opportunity of hearing him. He is unquestionably the clearest, the most powerful, and the most natural orator we ever listened to. It is impossible to hear him speak and not to attend, because he himself seems totally absorbed in the subject he discusses. It is difficult to attend and not to be convinced, for he appeals to principles common to all—he speaks only what every one thinks he would speak in similar circumstances, and the light of truth loses nothing of its brilliancy by the medium through which it is communicated.[12]

The Sisters of Mercy moved in June, 1834, to a larger house in Beaufain Street, and the Ursulines were given a temporary home in the house in Broad Street. The *Miscellany* for December 13, 1834, announces the purposes of the new Community as follows:

> Their object is the education of young Catholic ladies in all the becoming accomplishments of their sex, in the principles of pure religion and the practice of solid and unostentatious piety. Should others than members of their own church seek to profit by their care, the admission will be regulated upon principles which whilst they leave the discipline of their institute untouched, will satisfy those who may confide their children to their charge. They neither seek nor invite pupils of any denomination; but can not refuse their services under the circumstances prescribed by their rule. The house of which they have been members, has been for very many years known as one of the best regulated in Europe, and its pupils are found decorating the first circles of polished society.
>
> The ladies of the Charleston Convent, cannot, for some time,

[12]Cited in the *Cath. Misc.*, vol. XIV, p. 183.

be prepared to commence their duties, as it will require a few weeks to have their house set in order.

Such an institution has been wanted in the South, and we rejoice in the prospect which now opens to young ladies who desire to profit of the best opportunities.

In the same issue of the *Miscellany* we learn that five young Irish ladies who wished to enter the Sisters of Mercy of Charleston had also accompanied the Bishop in his journey from Liverpool.

At the Eleventh South Carolina Convention, held in Charleston on December 12, 1834, Dr. England spoke of the Ursulines and of the benefits all might expect from their school:

Amongst the objects which were to me most desirable and which I have always considered as likely to be most beneficial to this diocess, was one, to the accomplishment of which I had for many years looked forward, as claiming my best attention and continued exertions. After no small solicitude, and by no ordinary efforts, I am happy to inform you that it has been effected. A colony of religious ladies of the Ursuline order that has accompanied me from Ireland, now occupies the dwelling house and premises which I have some time since purchased adjoining this church. You are aware that one of the great objects of this order is the education of young ladies in the best accomplishments that befit their sex, as also in the practice of that piety which will save them from the seductions of a vicious world, an education that whilst it makes them ornamental to society will prepare them for heaven. The convent from which those ladies have come has long been favourably known in Ireland as one of the best houses of female education at the other side of the Atlantic, and one of the best regulated religious communities. We have been treated with singular favour in the selection of the ladies who now form the Charleston community. I give this testimony upon my own knowledge, because, during several years, I had the opportunity of personal acquaintance with the greater number. They neither desire nor need eulogy; they have made a great and a painful sacrifice for the purpose of affording to the young ladies of our communion, and to any others that might be entrusted to their care, those blessings which I am confident will be found to emanate from their institute. Nor have they been deterred from their enterprise by the melancholy accounts of an outrage upon their unoffending, useful, and meritorious sisters near Boston; a crime which has, in Europe, afforded a theme of exultation to the enemy of our country, and of our institutions. May God in his mercy forgive the wretch-

ed perpetrators of this deed of darkness! Of one consolation however, we are not likely to be deprived. The character of our fellow citizens, however they might differ from us in religious profession, is to us a guarantee that our establishments are safe, and that our city will not exhibit so foul a blot as that which disgraces the vicinity of a monument raised to commemorate a revolution, amongst whose results were the restoration of religious liberty to Maryland and its establishment generally through the other states of our Union.[13]

The orphans of the diocese were another object of his solicitude. Up to that time the Sisters of Mercy had cared for a limited number of these unfortunate children but Dr. England felt that a separate establishment was necessary.

At the close of the Convention, the clergy and the lay delegates proceeded in a body to the Ursuline Convent and an address of welcome was made to the nuns by Father Baker:

Respected Sisters:—

The clergy of the Diocess of Charleston, and the lay delegates of the Roman Catholic Church of South Carolina, beg leave to welcome you to their shores, and to hail your arrival amongst them as auspicious for the interests of religion, useful to the objects of virtue and influential in preserving the delicacy of sentiment, and upholding the dignity of your sex.

They cannot contemplate the character of the establishment by which you have been sent, without feeling convinced that its missionaries will sustain its reputation, in securing to the young ladies who might be confided to their care, those advantages so becoming to themselves, and so useful and ornamental to society, for which the pupils of that house have long been distinguished.

To the great body of American citizens, of every denomination, it has been a subject of deep concern, as to the Roman Catholics it has been a source of great affliction, that within the borders of these United States, your sisters should have been the victims of a wicked and wanton outrage, equally opposed to the principles of American policy as to the laws of civilized society; one which has already injured the reputation of our institutions in the eyes of other nations. You were aware of this unfortunate transaction before you took your departure from "the land of saints"; yet you did not hesitate upon the assurance of our venerated bishop to confide in the honourable feelings and chivalrous disposition of the South. Your devo-

[13] *Ibid.*, vol. XIV, p. 193.

tion calls for the expression of our acknowledgement. Nor shall you be disappointed: for though the members of our Church are comparatively few, we can assure you, that though separated from us in faith, our fellow citizens are united with us in feelings of respect for female virtue; and if need were, in every Carolinian heart you would experience sympathy, from every Carolinian hand you would find protection.

We then bid you welcome amongst us, we assure you of our readiness to do all that lies in our power to aid your generous efforts for the cause of religion, of virtue, of letters and of manners; and we pray that God to whose service you have devoted yourselves to crown you with every blessing.[14]

On January 3, 1835, the Ursulines sent out a notice to the effect that they were ready to receive scholars and visitors.

There were therefore at the beginning of the New Year of 1835 the following Catholic educational establishments in the city of Charleston: the Philosophical and Classical Seminary for boys; the Diocesan Seminary, attached to the former; the Sisters of Mercy, for the elementary training of girls, to which was attached a small diocesan orphanage; the Ursuline Academy for the higher education of girls; and the young ladies' school of the Dames de la Retraite, who appealed mainly to the French citizens of Charleston, but who had not been canonically accepted into the diocese, owing to the absence of the necessary papers from their mother-house in France. Advertisements for all these institutions will be found in the *Miscellany* at this time. There was work enough for all, and while there was danger of confusion from within, difficulties and opposition were to come mainly from outside, as is natural in all works of a spiritual kind.

The first blow struck not only at the Ursulines but at all religious life for women came in the publication of Rebecca Reed's infamous composition *Six Months in a Convent.* Purporting to give an intimate insight into the life of the Ursulines, the book made a sensation in the United States, and particularly in Charleston, where the Ursulines had been so recently established. The *Miscellany* met the issue courageously, and the friends of Dr. England in the city were quick to come to his aid in denouncing the attack made on defenseless ladies whose purpose was to add to the progress of education.

[14] *Ibid.*, p. 198.

Opposition came at the same time from another quarter, and for a while the press rang with charges and counter-charges on the "Foreign Conspiracy"; namely, on the evil that was said to lurk in the charitable work of the foreign missionary societies of Vienna, Munich and Lyons.

A summary of the educational work of the diocese is given in Bishop England's address to the Eighth Georgia Convention, held in Augusta, May 10, 1835:

> You are aware that for some years I have been engaged in efforts to establish in this Diocess some houses of those useful women, who under the regulations of religion and the bond of a vow, devote themselves to the works of spiritual and corporal mercy:—to the instruction of the ignorant, to the education of youth, to the protection of the orphan, to the leading by admonition and example in the way of virtue, in the practice of piety, to regions of more pure enjoyment than we can expect here below, to the solace of the afflicted, to the care of the despised and the neglected, and to smoothing the pillow of disease, encouraging those who languish in sickness, endeavouring to restore them to health or to cheer them on towards heaven. To a considerable extent, it has pleased God to bless those efforts. Aided by a faithful clergy, and seconded by the devotedness of the females who desire thus to consecrate themselves to God, I have the gratification of seeing the Sisters of Our Lady of Mercy in Charleston, assiduously occupied in the care of a very flourishing and remarkably well regulated school, training up the children entrusted in their care in science, in virtue and in habits of industry; they have also charge of some orphans, for whose support voluntary contributions have been occasionally made; and in the advances which they have made in their internal discipline, I flatter myself that I perceive the sure promise of permanence and usefulness. A number of young persons of their sex who are desirous of joining their institute, have accompanied me from Ireland: and if, as I should hope may be the case, they will be found fit and continue desirous of joining them, I trust, that before long, you would feel it to be a duty to have the benefits of the institute extended to this state; for though we could not at present yield to such an application, I trust the day when we could, is not distant.
>
> There are other ladies in Charleston, some of whom have belonged to religious institutes in France, who are desirous of forming an establishment in that city, or at least in the

Diocess. I am exceedingly anxious for their success, hitherto some little difficulties have prevented their perfect organization, as a religious community; but I trust they will soon be fully removed. Amongst them are persons eminently qualified to fulfil the duties to which they are devoted. Their school has been for a considerable time in operation, and they have given satisfaction to those who have entrusted their children to their care. It will be an additional blessing to the Diocess should they succeed.

One of my earliest resolutions when I undertook the charge of this Diocess, was to establish therein one of the best houses for the most perfect education of young ladies. I had long known the peculiar qualifications of the Ursuline community in Cork for this important task. I have since then had many opportunities in various parts of this and of the European continent as well as in the British Isles, for obtaining an intimate acquaintance with the first establishments for female education, and the result of my observation was to confirm me in my original intention of endeavouring to procure a colony from that house. This I was so fortunate as to effect, and some of the ladies of that community have accompanied me to this country, and are now established near the Cathedral in Charleston. They have at the beginning of the year commenced their labours. Their principal object is the instruction of young ladies of their own communion in the highest branches of literature and the most becoming accomplishments that befit their sex, whilst they train them up to a solid practice of perfect piety. They invite none; they are ready to fufill the duties which they have undertaken, under the proper circumstances. Should any of our brethren of other religious denominations desire to profit by their school, they hold out no inducements; they openly exhibit the conditions on which the children of such parents will be received. Should applications be made from such quarters, it will be for those who apply to determine after having received accurate information.

I have thought it right to exhibit thus to you the exertions that have been made to increase the facilities for the improvement of your children, as well as to procure advantages for yourselves.[15]

On May 19, 1835, Miss Woulfe was received into the Ursuline community, her postulantship having ended about that time. It was intended at first to make the ceremony a private one, but so many

[15] *Ibid.*, p. 371.

applications for admission had come from non-Catholics, that Dr. England decided to have the ceremony for all who wished to come. Over seven hundred persons were present in the Cathedral, and it was on this occasion that Dr. England preached the sermon on the meaning of the religious life, which has been mentioned in a previous chapter.

A movement was begun in the spring of the year to secure for the Sisters of Mercy a house better suited to their numbers and their duties, and private donations were made for the purpose. In June, 1834, these amounted to over $1,500. Writing to a friend in Rome, on April 7, 1835, Dr. England says, that when he returned to Charleston, he found the Institute of the Sisters of Our Lady of Mercy in great confusion and disorder. "I have by great application framed their rules, and re-established them in peace, charity, regularity and piety. I have admitted several of them to renew their vows which are annual, after I had for three months refused to receive them until they should become regular. They are now exceedingly useful. The Ursulines are a great treasure for me and will do much good, though as yet their school is not numerous. Their conduct is exemplary and their accomplishments very respectable."

Dr. England had decided to ascertain the canonical rating of the Dames de la Retraite, and in this same letter explained their curious situation:

> There is a lady, Madame Hery, who belonged to the Dames de la Retraite in the Diocess of Troyes in France. She got permission from her superiors to come to the U. S. to found a house of their society. In New York she gave the habit and admitted to the vows another French woman. Leaving that city she went to Philadelphia, where with flaming advertisements she began a school which failed in less than six months. She came hither about 18 months since; and I consented, if she would occupy herself and her companions in such moderate teaching as they were qualified to undertake, that they might establish themselves in this city. She asked my permission to bring an *assistante* from France whom she described as very useful. I consented. Upon my arrival, I found the "assistante" who appears to me a good and clever woman. But upon looking over her documents I find that she came from some congregation of Ursulines, and with permission to live in America observing her vows. I stated that I expected a woman of the same institute, Dames de la Retraite, whose

dress she wore. Madame Hery told me that she gave her their habit, and that she could renew her vows as a "Dame de la Retraite". I have no copy of the rules of the congregation that she left. I said I could not recognize her until I got the directions of the Holy See; that I would not until then recognize the few that were there as a community, but that they might live together and do what good they would until I should get directions from Rome. I wish to know whether I can permit this transfer, and allow this Ursuline to join the Dames de la Retraite. They are all, I believe, good, but have those notions that so frequently perplex those from their country in a republic which they can never understand.[16]

During the summer of 1835, Dr. England opened a school for the free negroes of Charleston. No action of his career was considered more imprudent by his friends in the city. The anti-slavery riots of 1834 had stirred public consideration of the Abolition movement to white heat. The stand taken by several religious bodies on the slavery issue at the beginning of 1833 was the first step towards the division which has lasted in their ranks up to the present. "The events, however", writes McMaster, "which make the year 1833 memorable in the anti-slavery struggle, were caused by the action of the American Anti-Slavery Society. A circular was sent forth to the auxiliary societies, asking for thirty thousand dollars for more agents, more periodicals, and the free distribution of anti-slavery tracts. During the first week of each month *Human Rights*, a small paper, was to be published; in the second the *Anti-Slavery Record*, a magazine with cuts; in the third, the *Emancipator;* and in the fourth the *Slaves' Friend*, a magazine for the young."[17]

These papers were sent by the thousands into the Southern States. The *Southern Patriot* of Charleston announced on January 29, 1836, that the mail which had arrived by steamer from New York was crammed with copies of these anti-slavery papers addressed to prominent citizens in that city, and elsewhere in the South. A mob was organized, the Post Office was entered, and the Abolition papers and tracts removed and burned on the Parade Ground in the presence of a large crowd, gathered under the guns of the Citadel.[18] "Whilst

---

[16]*Records* (ACHS), vol. VIII, pp. 210-211.
[17]*History of the People of the United States*, vol. VI, p. 222. New York, 1906.
[18]Schlesinger, *Political and Social History of the United States (1829-1925)*, p. 95. New York, 1925.

they were at the Post Office," Dr England writes on February 23, 1836, to Paul Cullen:

> Two or three of my flock, who were mingled in the crowd and whose religion was not suspected, overheard them arrange that as soon as they concluded at the Post-Office they would come to the Seminary and give me (I lived there) the benefit of Lynch's Law, tear down the buildings and the church, &c. I was soon called out of bed by two of my flock whom I admitted into the yard and from whom I learned these particulars. They added that some armed men would soon join us, as they had sent messengers to warn the Irish who form one of the volunteer corps of the city militia. These latter began speedily to arrive with their guns and bayonets. The French were also notified, but we had only two of their number.
>
> After a short deliberation and prayer in the Church, I concluded that if we should be attacked we had better resist than allow the Church, and the Convent of the Ursulines, and the Seminary, and ourselves, to be destroyed. I then came out and a pretty large force assembled, and their officers arriving, I told them that I hoped we should have no contest, but that I would use their aid if necessary, provided they pledged themselves to obey me and would invest me with the command. To this they assented. I then stationed sentinels, and showed the officers the best points of defence for the whole of our possessions; charging them, if an assault were made, not to have a shot fired until I would give directions. Some of our people then went out into the streets, and the intimation was soon privately conveyed through the city that we were prepared. We kept guard for two nights, and no attempt was made to molest us. On the second day several of the most respectable citizens of all religions sent to have their names enrolled on our guard; and the city officers said they were ready with their whole force to come to us should we need their assistance. A respectable committee of citizens then called on me to request I would discontinue the school for negroes. I answered that if they made the same application to those of other religions who had schools I would comply, though I disapproved of their proceeding. They applied, and all the schools were closed. The public authorities convened the citizens, and measures were taken to guard against the efforts of the Abolitionists, and thanks were returned to those who closed the schools. I attended the meeting, and sat with

presiding magistrate in the most conspicuous place, by the courtesy of the sheriff who is an Irish Catholic.[19]

In South Carolina, the Slave Code prohibited the teaching of slaves, but allowed the education of free negroes. Dr. England had found in his fifteen years' experience in Charleston that many free Catholic negroes had lost the Faith by being enrolled in sectarian schools, and he did not anticipate any trouble when he established his own colored school with two seminarians and two Ursulines as teachers. On account of the superior instruction given in this school, the number of children increased rapidly. Within a month eighty-four free negroes were enrolled and in many cases their parents, fallen-away Catholics, were brought back to the Church. In the midst of this success, the excitement over the Abolition tracts occurred. Dr. England's legation to Haiti was resented, because it was interpreted as a favorable attitude of the Holy See towards the abolition of slavery in the South. Some time before this occurrence, Dr. England had written an open letter to his friend, Daniel O'Connell, taking the Liberator to task for interfering in a domestic problem such as slavery in the South, and in consequence was hailed by some as an Abolitionist.

The rumor was spread abroad that Dr. England had received and retained one of the mischievous anti-slavery tracts. On July 30, 1835, he published an open letter in the *Courier* denying the charge and adding: "I will add, that I know no Carolinian who more sincerely deplores, more fully condemns, or more seriously reprobates the conduct of those men, who, by pouring them in upon us, are destroying our peace, and endangering our safety. Nor do I know a single Roman Catholic, clerical or lay, with whom I conversed on the subject, who is not fully determined to use his best efforts to prevent the mischief of their interference."

The day before he sent to Mr. Alexander H. Brown, Chairman of the South Carolina Association, the following message:

---

[19] *Records* (ACHS), vol. VIII, pp. 220-221. Dr. England's friend, Judge William Gaston, delivered an address in 1832 before the State University of North Carolina in which he called upon the students to aid in the extirpation of slavery, "because it stifles industry and represses enterprise . . . . . and poisons morals at the fountain head". Hart, *Slavery and Abolition,* p. 176. New York, 1906.

To the Presiding Officer of the S. C. Association
Seminary, Broad St.

July 29th, 1835.

Sir:—Previous to my going to Europe, about four years since, I had determined to establish a school for the instruction of the Coloured portion of my flock, but determined not only to keep most respectfully obedient to the law, but also in full accordance with the reasonable wishes of a large bulk of our Southern fellow citizens.

I then, through a friend since dead, (Mr. Sam'l Gourdin), wrote to inform the South Carolina Association of my object, so that at any time I may be advised of their wishes, as I considered that through them I could learn the general sentiment upon the subject. My absence from the State, and other circumstances, prevented the execution of my intentions at that time.

Upon my return hither in December, I determined to await the decision of the Legislature upon a bill then pending, regarding the instruction of negroes. I found that the act which they passed did not interfere with my views, but I considered from its provisions that the legislature looked upon the education of the free coloured populations, to be safe in the way which I contemplate: and I concluded that I would best comply with its intentions in having those persons instructed, to a limited extent, under my own inspection.

Not having the good fortune to meet with Mr. Henry Deas, the President of the Association, I sought Mr. Sheriff Irving, whom I considered its Secretary, and communicated my intentions to him, with the request that he would have them stated to that body, for the purpose of my acting under their power of inspection.

I was also informed that there were, during many years, schools of coloured persons taught by whites, and that others were about to be established, and that therefore, I should have no difficulty upon the subject, as the law, that left it fully open, was plain.

Now, I find it rumoured that the existence of this school, which I desired and determined always to have open to the inspection of every respectable Carolinian, is not pleasing to several of my fellow citizens. I believe it is notorious that it has been denounced in a public print, upon sectarian grounds. My disposition is not to act in opposition to the wishes of any respectable portion of the community in regard to any political, civil or social subject, even under the permission of the law, but I do not think that when I act only in

the same manner as other citizens are allowed to do, that I alone, should be selected as the object of complaint or animadversion.

There are other schools in this city similar to that which I established. If it be the wish of the citizens that they should be discontinued, let that wish be signified to all indiscriminately by the City Council, by the South Carolina Association, and I shall not be found backward in sacrificing my opinion to their advice.

I have the honor to be, Sir, very respectfully,

Your obedient humble servant,

✠ JOHN,

Bishop of Charleston.

I trust that such of my fellow citizens as read the above documents, and consider that almost every congregation in the city has its school for the instruction of its coloured population, will not be disposed to express themselves of me in the terms in which I understood some have, without due reflection indulged.

I am, Sirs, respectfully,

✠ JOHN,

Bishop of Charleston.[20]

* * *

Mr. Brown replied:

CHARLESTON, July 30, 1835.

To the Right Rev. Bishop England.

Dear Sir:—Your letter addressed to the South Carolina Association, has been read before the Executive Committee, who have instructed me in reply to state, that they have considered the School under your directions, in connexion with others recently established, as authorized by the present existing law, and that no particular exception has ever been made to the one under your control. The only action ever had on that subject in the Committee, was the establishment of a supervision over these schools. On this being intimated to the gentlemen under whose immediate management your school is placed, it was readily acquiesced in by him.

Your communication is understood by us to be an additional acquiescence in our supervision.

Very respectfully,

ALEX. H. BROWN,

Chairman of the South Carolina Association.

---

[20] *Cath. Misc.*, vol. XV, p. 38.

The schools in Charleston for free negroes were eventually closed. In a general meeting, at which Dr. England was present, held on August 4, the following resolution, among others was passed:

> *Resolved*, That for the purpose of making such an earnest appeal to the people of the non slave-holding States as may convince them of the true state of public feeling amongst us, it would in the opinion of this meeting be desirable to bring about a cordial co-operation among all the States having a common interest with us, either through a CONVENTION, or in any other way, best calculated to embody public sentiment, so that *the truth may be made known,* that however we may differ among ourselves on other points, we are on this subject *united as one man in the fixed and unalterable determination to maintain our rights, and to defend our property against all attacks—be the consequences what they may.*

An interesting item occurs in the *Miscellany* for October 17, 1835, announcing the publication of *The Ursuline Manual*, probably the first Catholic book of devotion printed in the Southern States.

Late in April, 1836, Dr. England started again for Haiti, and after completing his negotiations with the President of that Republic, returned to Charleston at the end of May, setting out for Rome, by way of New York, the following month. While in New York, he preached at St. Peter's Church, in Barclay Street, where Father Power was pastor. The *Green Banner* for June 25 says of him:

> We have never heard him with greater delight. Fervid, eloquent, and logical, he was evidently in that happy mood when the spirit of the subject comes over the mind possessing, absorbing and guiding. There was no word idly thrown away, all was energy, nerve, and strength. We cannot write higher praise. Bishop England reasoned eloquently and well. The petty artifices of the declaimer were disclaimed. His very features shewed the purpose of his mind; and what is this but eloquence, in its true character! Cicero says "quid aliud est eloquentia, nisi motus animae continuus". The church was packed to suffocation, and thousands, who could not enter, anxiously sought to hear the Bishop's words in the grave yard and streets.

Mother Mary Moloney accompanied Bishop England to Liverpool. On July 27, 1836, he was in Cork, and after leaving Mother Moloney at the Blackrock Convent, where she was to secure the services of more Sisters for Charleston, Dr. England set out for

Rome on the 29th. In November following, he was back again in Cork, and on the twelfth of that month left for Dublin en route to Charleston, accompanied by Mother Moloney and three Ursuline nuns who had volunteered for the work in South Carolina.

During Dr. England's absence, the Sisters of Mercy lost their Superioress, Mother Benedicta (Julia Datty), who died on October 3, 1836, in the seventieth year of her age. Julia Datty was born in San Domingo, was educated in Paris, and was one of the refugees to Charleston from her native island at the time of the French Revolution. With her wealth, which was considerable, she spent her life, before the establishment of the Charleston Sisters of Mercy, in training young girls in intellectual and domestic education. She was one of the first to join the Sisters and was elected Superioress in 1834. Her death was spoken of as a public calamity, for during fifty years she went about the city doing good to all.

Dr. England arrived in Charleston in January, 1837. At the Thirteenth South Carolina Convention, held on January 22, 1837, in Charleston, he speaks of the two teaching orders in the diocese:

> Since, we have last met, I have been enabled to do still more in securing the permanent establishment of the Convent of Ursuline Nuns in this city. The lady at the head of that institution has accompanied me to Europe, amongst other objects for the purpose of removing unpleasant impressions which had, in some way, been there made respecting the situation and prospects of the filiation which has been given to us, and which created a doubt whether it would not be proper that it should be recalled. I am happy to inform you that this object has been perfectly attained, and she has returned, accompanied by another professed religious of the same house and a young lady who is desirous of being admitted to enter their order. A number of similar applications were received, but it was deemed expedient not to be over hasty in adding to the numbers of the community. So far as it has gone this institute has exceeded my expectations and bids fair to realize our most sanguine hopes of securing to the Diocess one of the best schools for the education of young ladies in the useful and ornamental acquirements that befit those of their sex who are to decorate the most polished circles of society and in those virtues which win the esteem of man and secure the approbation of Heaven.
>
> The congregation of Sisters of Our Lady of Mercy has also made considerable progress towards assuming a permanent

form and is extending its sphere of usefulness. It enjoys equally the confidence and favour of the laity as the esteem of the clergy and the approbation of the prelates. To you who are so well acquainted with the utility of their institute and the conduct of the Sisters, little need be said to interest you in their behalf... It is unfortunately too notorious not only in these states but through Europe, and I may indeed say through the civilized world, that bad men and wicked women have brought some discredit not upon this description of establishments, but upon a country which we love; by their efforts to libel those retreats of piety, those schools of virtue, those asylums of the afflicted, in which orphaned childhood and deserted age as well as extenuated sickness receive the consoling protection of devoted charity. The pestilential breath of calumny has also endeavoured to taint the fair name of those schools of science which have been reared in the midst of purity for the benefit of youthful innocence. The dark ruins of one such edifice blacken the surface of a spot which could once lay claim to a place amongst the enlightened and the unprejudiced: nor has the legislature of Massachusetts done anything to obliterate the stain. In another state the terrors of the law extorted the retraction of a similar calumny. But we have reason to hope that amongst our brethren of other religious denominations there are vast numbers who, though they refuse to adopt our principles or embrace our tenets, yet are honourably disposed to render justice to ourselves and to protect us to the fullest extent in the enjoyment of that religious freedom which is our undoubted right by the constitution of our State and by the principles of our federative Union. Our gratitude is due not alone to individuals amongst whom one respectable public writer in the city of New York is conspicuous, who have fairly examined and boldly exposed those productions, which like former fabrications of a like description in other days and in other places, are chiefly remarkable for the astounding enormity of their falsehoods and the astonishing hardihood of their imagery. They too have been, in their day, in like manner refuted and exposed. Yet do they continue, this notwithstanding, to be grounds of reference for the ill-intentioned or the ill-informed who are desirous of diffusing the poison which they contain. So will these and similar compilations be spread abroad whilst there is to be in the world a morbid appetite or a vitiated taste loving such aliment, and sufficiently wealthy to enrich those who will pander to its voracity. But we owe special acknowledgment to the legislature of South Carolina for having at

> the very crisis of this delusion, and disregarding the cabals of our opponents, done us the justice of incorporating those two institutions to which I have drawn your attention. Nor was this concession made through the effort of a party nor by the votes of Roman Catholics, but by the joint action of the leading members of adverse political divisions and *by an assembly of which not a single Catholic occupied a seat in either house.*[21]

On August 31, 1837, the first religious profession occurred in the Cathedral. The desire on the part of citizens of all creeds to be present was so marked that it was determined to permit admission by invitation only. Miss Woulfe made her profession, taking the black veil, and was henceforth known in religion as Sister Mary Joseph De Sales. Bishop England preached practically the same sermon as that of May 19, 1835. This was the first religious profession of an Ursuline in the diocese.

Dr. England left for Europe for a third time on business connected with the diocese on February 17, 1837, and returned on April 16, 1837. At the Fourteenth South Carolina Convention, held in Charleston, on October 29, 1837, he announced that he had been obliged on account of the monetary expense to forbid the Sisters of Mercy to accept orphans in the future. Great progress had been made towards the perfection of the Institute of Our Lady of Mercy. Hitherto he had been prevented from completing its constitution and rules, not so much by reason of his absence, as because he desired to test by experience and practice the operation of such regulations as he desired to embody therein. Of the Ursulines he says:

> It will, I am convinced, gratify you to learn that the Ursuline community continues in the unobstrusive spirit of its members not only to make considerable progress towards its permanent establishment amongst us, but has already conferred extensive benefits by its admirable system of education, and by the charity with which it has devoted itself to the religious instruction of females of every age, of every colour, and of every condition in society. I need not of course advert to the circumstance, that their own means supply the demands of their institute.

On April 27, 1838, one-third of the city was laid in ashes by a conflagration which consumed St. Mary's Church in Hasell Street.

[21] *Ibid.*, vol. XVI, p. 227. The Archiepiscopal Archives of Quebec contain several letters from Dr. England about this time relative to the Ursulines.

In July, 1838, Dr. England called a special meeting of the St. John the Baptist Society for the purpose of considering the unfortunate situation of many Catholic laborers who had come to the city. Many of these, on account of their ignorance of the climate and the customs, had become idle and destitute, and he believed something in the nature of a social welfare group should be formed to guide and to aid the strangers. On August 25, the *Miscellany* announced the establishment of a society of workingmen, called the Brotherhood of San Marino. As the first society of workingmen in the United States to be established under Catholic auspices, the Brotherhood presents some unique constitutional features. Bishop England was President. All the officers were Catholics, but it was not necessary to be a member of the Catholic Church to join the Society. In the monthly meetings, "no conversation shall be allowed upon the subjects of politics, elections, religious controversy, national or sectional distinctions, or of any other description which may tend to destroy harmony or to create altercation or unpleasant feelings between the members." One of the main objects of the Brotherhood was the support of a small hospital, wherein their members might be taken care of during the epidemics which came so frequently to Charleston. The "Stranger's Fever" was prevalent in the city at the time the Brotherhood was organized. Dr. England speaks of the fever in the issue of September 1, 1838:

> Though not exactly our department, yet we will venture to express an opinion: that this visitation arose not more from the state of the earth and atmosphere, than from the predisposition of many persons newly arrived in the city, and from the wretchedness and want of suitable accommodation in some of their boarding houses, as well as from their own great imprudence.
>
> We have had such a summer as Charleston has not experienced for a century before. To an oppressive and for many weeks unmitigated heat, there succeeded a continued deluge of rain for some days,—and though the public parts of the city were kept more than usually clean, still there was in numbers of the private houses of our poorer citizens abundant counterbalancing accumulation.
>
> A large portion of the city had been destroyed, so that we did not possess our usual extent of accommodations, and great numbers of tradesmen and labourers poured in to rebuild the city, so that with far less than our usual facilities, we had to

provide for far more than our usual number of inhabitants, Many of the boarding houses of these strangers were greatly overcrowded; in many instances, there was a want of ventilation, in others no protection against the night air; the rooms were not kept sufficiently clean, the bedding was greatly neglected. There existed a gross carelessness of taking the precautions to which even they who are acclimated have recourse —frequently there was no knowledge of what the precautions were. Hence when sickness came upon us, it found a large number of subjects, not only predisposed to embibe it, but in the very worst position for its reception. Although several remarkably well conducted and temperate persons were amongst those who were the first attacked, still a very great proportion were persons whose habitual use of great quantities of ardent spirits, and those of the most deleterious quality, were assailed and it was indeed almost a hopeless task to undertake their restoration. Even when they sickened they had but little attendance, and very poor accommodation. To strangers, a consciousness of their peculiar liability and the desolate feeling which a contemplation of their isolated situation produces, oppresses the soul, appalls the strong, bewilders the imagination, and is a grand predisposing cause.

To the combination of all these circumstances, we attribute the formidable appearance of this disease at its entrance and the long catalogue of victims which it has been our duty to record. A large number of strangers have left the city within the last week, and thereby many of the causes of disease have been removed, as well as the numbers of those liable to it diminished. The weather has also improved—so that although we cannot cherish the hope that Charleston will be free from the Stranger's fever for some time to come; yet the ravages will be greatly confined, and the number of its victims limited. This however is not the great question. One far more important requires attention. Our city can not dispense with the services of the persons thus liable. And are we to be perpetually exposed to a recurrence of this calamity? Is the healthful character of our city to be destroyed? Can no means be devised to provide against such a visitation every year? We are of opinion that it may be easily effected. Eleven years have gone by since we have suffered thus to any extent. And we think a mode may still be devised by which the services and the comparative safety of this class of industrious persons may be secured.[22]

---

[22] *Ibid.*, vol. XVIII, p. 70.

Under the direction of two Sisters of Mercy, Sister M. Vincent Mahoney and Sister M. Veronica Cagney, a group of volunteer nurses labored night and day in the houses which the Brotherhood had turned into a temporary hospital during the fever. There was apparently a strong reluctance on the part of the strangers in the city to go to the public hospital. The obituary lists in the *Miscellany* at this time show the malignancy of the disease. Almost all who died were young. On November 15, 1838, we read in the *Miscellany*:

> The sickness has not abated. The obituary which we publish today, for the double purpose of requesting prayers for the deceased, and of conveying the melancholy tidings to their distant friends and relatives, is sufficient evidence of the state of our city. It is the largest catalogue of deaths in our church in this city which has ever been set forth in one week. Besides those on the list; perhaps one or two who professed to belong to the church, but who did not seek the aid of the ministry, have died. We insert only the names of those who have sought and, who have received the Sacraments.
>
> In addition, there have been four deaths of our coloured members.
>
> The prevalence of the disease has not subsided nor is it probable that it will be diminished until towards the end of the present month. In some instances its type is more mild, but we are far from saying that the disease is less fatal, though the experience of the faculty is better able to cope with it.
>
> The charitable exertions of our fellow-citizens, the benevolent activity of the Mayor, seconded by the wise liberality of the council; added to the untiring charity of our medical men, are effecting much in the way of relief.
>
> In addition to the accommodation which the Hospital of San Marino has afforded to the members of its own Society, of whom 2 have died and 6 have been restored to health in the present week, the Poor house has received great numbers of patients; many of whom have been restored to health. The Mayor, however, having been satisfied by personal inspection there was need of much more accommodation for the sick, has obtained the use of the Medical college in Queen-street, for the purpose of establishing there another Hospital, and has organized committees of ladies and of gentlemen for its superintendence. So that, we trust, still more will be done to relieve the afflicted and to secure to our city her well deserved character for affectionate benevolence to the sick and the indigent.

The mortality table given on October 27, 1838, states that the number of Catholics who died of the fever from August 11 to October 26 was as follows:

Natives of the United States	13
" of Ireland	83
" of Germany	11
" of Italy	6
" of France	6
" of Dalmatia	4
" of Poland	2
	125

Of whom, 109 were interred in the Cemetery of St. Patrick's Church on the Neck.[23]

At an anniversary meeting of the Brotherhood of San Marino, a report, made by Father William Burke, the chairman of the active committee of the Society, contains an insight into social conditions of the day:

> It is a well-known fact, that the greater part of the working class of our city are strangers, persons who have left their home for the purpose of procuring, by their exertions, an honest and respectable livelihood in that land, where merit is appreciated and industry rewarded. It is true, they were willing, while at home, with stout hearts and strong arms to toil for a subsistence for themselves and their families, but unfortunately, owing to the peculiar circumstances of their respective countries, many were denied that competency which they desired, and hence, deserting their home and their friends they have come amongst us, in the first place, to benefit themselves, and in the second, that they might aid in sustaining that country which had received them.
>
> It will be easily seen, that the greater part of such persons, are destitute of that assistance which is necessary, when they are attacked by sickness or disease. They are placed in boarding houses, where very little attention can be paid them, and surrounded by persons who have, perhaps, very little acquaintance with the manner of treating patients, particularly those who labour under that fever peculiar to our southern climate. It is true, the persons holding those houses may be well disposed, and may be anxious to relieve the patients, but still, from the want of that experience which is necessary, they may allow the beings under their care to suffer a lingering

[23] *Ibid.*, p. 87.

illness and close it by death, whereas, had they more skill in the treatment of the disease, and more time to devote to the patients, the latter would be rescued not only from death, but also from those bitter sufferings consequent on their being neglected.

The committee have not only their own experience for the proof of this assertion, but also the opinion of many prudent and judicious physicians. Besides it is well known and generally admitted that many persons are neglected, as regards their spiritual welfare, when the individuals in whose care they are placed feel very little interested, and hence the poor patients are permitted, as it often happens, to close their eyes on this earthly scene without a sufficient preparation for that judgment which awaits them, whereas had the lessons of religion been placed before their view death would have for them no sting nor the grave a victory.

One other circumstance may be adduced which intimately regards the working population of Charleston; viz., it often happens that the effects of strangers dying far away from their native home are lost to their friends for ever, and though these friends may be in such circumstances as to require assistance and though the means left by the deceased be considerable, still, from want of any proper persons to look after the property, or from the dishonest dealings of individuals, the entire is alienated from its proper uses, and the poor friends neglected. Of this also the Committee have sufficient proof.

The Right Rev. Dr. England being well aware of this, and seeing with regret all the evils of the state of things to which we allude, made an effort to remedy them in a manner which has called forth the approbation, not only of his own particular flock, but also of the citizens of Charleston generally. After calling together those who would feel an interest in his designs, and laying before them his own views of the subject, it was resolved, by the few who at first met, that some measure should be adopted in order to secure the best interests of emigrants.

Several meetings were subsequently held, and the advice of those meetings taken on the subject, and finally on the 22nd of July, 1838, the Society was founded under the title of The Society of the Brotherhood of St. Marino; and by its formation was effected, not only the relief of the distressed, but more, a union was formed among many, a social intercourse was established, a stimulus was given to charity, and the stranger has the satisfaction of knowing, that if he were on the bed of sickness, the hand of kindness was to smooth its pillow,

and if he was far away from those friends on whom he might have a natural claim, he had here those who were bound to him by a stronger and a more holy tie, that of charity, which the Apostle declares is the greatest of all virtues.

The objects of this society, then, are—to secure the health of the *industrious and well-conducted* working men of this city, to afford them an opportunity of complying with their duty in whatever religion they profess, to watch over the property and effects of its associates, and in case of death, to apply them in the manner prescribed by the deceased brother, to take a parental care of the orphans they may leave behind them, in a word, to ensure their respectability on earth and their happiness in heaven, & to adopt all means to that effect, by causing each to take an interest in his brother, by withdrawing him from the ways of crime, and leading him in the paths of virtue.

One of the first objects of the society was to open an hospital where particular care would be paid to the members of the institution. Accordingly a convenient place was taken in Queen-street, and on the 14th of August the first patient was admitted under the care of the Sisters of Mercy, and from that date up to the 1st of October, when the epidemic began to subside, there were admitted on the whole, 36, of which number 5 were admitted a second time, 12 died, 1 of consumption, 1 of dropsy and 10 of yellow fever, 5 of which were desperate cases at the time of admission, and 7 of an ordinary character, making a total of 12 who died, and 19 who were discharged convalescent. For a statement of the accounts and expenditures, the society are referred to the report of the committee on accounts.

The Committee look to the past with the full assurance that the Society has done its duty faithfully, and that the objects of the institution have been, at least partially, attained. The past year has been a trying one indeed for the people of Charleston, but in a particular manner, for the poor and labouring classes. The chastising hand of God was felt in every street. The Angel of destruction was, as it were, executing the vengeance of heaven on a sinful people. The wife was torn from the bosom of her fond husband, and the father was swept away, leaving behind him the innocent and unprotected children, of whom he was the support—in a word, almost every house had its own share of affliction. Such being the case, it will be easily seen that a fair field was offered to the Brotherhood of St. Marino, to test their usefulness, and to ascertain whether the happy results which they hoped for, would

crown their labours. Nor were they disappointed.—The testimony of numbers might be adduced to prove how fearlessly, and with what christian fortitude the Brotherhood of St. Marino acted during the fever of '38, and to show with what zeal, perseverance and becoming devotion, they not only sought for those who were sick, but also attended them and ministered to their comforts when found. They were united by a common tie, they were prepared for the worst—the love of their neighbor was their motive, the approbation of heaven their reward.

The Committee deem this a proper place for expressing their gratitude and that of the Society in general, for the kind, generous and truly christian manner in which the Sisters of Mercy have devoted themselves to the interests of this institution, and the good of their fellow-beings. They have seen, and witnessed with admiration, the noble sacrifices made by these ladies in the cause of charity. They have beheld those pious females in the still hour of night leaning over the bed of disease, ministering to the wants of the body, and breathing the words of consolation to the soul. The Committee have not only witnessed this in regard to others, but have also experienced it themselves, and therefore are capable of testifying to the usefulness of the institution of the Sisters of Mercy, nor were their exertions confined to the hospital of St. Marino, on the contrary, they were extended to every part of the city where the poverty or affliction of individuals required them, nor were they actuated by any motive, save the love of God and their neighbour; and the Committee are also pleased at finding in their intercourse with the community that such is the general opinion in their regard.[24]

At the next appearance of the "Stranger's Fever" (July, 1839), the Sisters of Mercy offered the Brotherhood a house in Queen Street, rent-free.

On July 28, 1839, Mother Mary Charles Moloney, the first Superioress of the Ursulines, died after a long illness, in the fifty-fourth year of her age, and in a long "Memoir" which Bishop England published in the *Miscellany* after her death, he describes the origin of the Ursuline Community of Charleston, and tells how some Catholics of Philadelphia who had accompanied Mother Mary Charles and her little group from Liverpool, attempted through Bishop Kenrick to persuade the nuns to abandon Charleston and to settle in that city.

---

[24] *Ibid.*, pp. 318-319.

In September, 1839, three of the Sisters of Mercy answered Father Barry's request to go to Augusta to nurse the victims of the yellow fever, and opened there a hospital for that purpose. The result of this heroic action is told in the *Miscellany* for November 16, 1839:

> In the early part of August when the fever exhibited its marked virulence at Augusta, the greatest want which afflicted the patients, especially the poor, was that of nurses and accommodation. The Rev. John Barry, the zealous pastor of the Church of the Holy Trinity in that city, unhesitatingly placed the residence which he occupied at the disposal of the Board of Health, as a temporary hospital, and at the request of the indefatigable Mayor of Augusta, the Hon. Alfred Cumming, applied to the Bishop for a few of the Sisters of Our Lady of Mercy to attend the patients. Every sister, as was her duty, cheerfully placed her services at his disposal, and each seemed desirous of being selected. Three of them were sent by the return of the Railroad cars, and were kindly met at Hamburg by a committee of the Board of Health. The Mayor, whose labours were arduous and unremitting, though he was only convalescent, called on them and offered them the hospitality of his house, which they politely declined, preferring to enter at once upon the discharge of the duty for which they were sent; and patients were quickly placed under their care. They were accompanied by the Rev. T. J. Cronin, whom the Bishop sent to aid Mr. Barry, whose duties had now become too onerous.
>
> The Sisters were fully employed until the end of October. On the 2d Nov. they returned to this city, accompanied by the Rev. J. Barry, and were lavish in their expressions of gratitude for the kind attentions they had received in Augusta. It was determined by the city Council that the expenses of their journey should be defrayed, besides providing for them during their sojourn. On their departure, a sum fully sufficient to defray the expenses of the journey to and from Augusta was tendered to Mr. Barry, but declined; upon the ground that he was instructed not to receive it, as the Catholics of Charleston felt that in the affliction of their sister city, they ought not at least make any charge for charitable aid, and the more especially as a great portion of the patients were Roman Catholics. The number attended in the Hospital was nearly 70—of whom about 20 died.
>
> We are informed that the Roman Catholic congregation of the church of the Purification of the Blessed Virgin Mary at Locust Grove, about 60 miles from Augusta, generously con-

tributed a sum of about two hundred dollars to aid in relieving the sick of Augusta—and also that a handsome contribution was made by the Presbyterian congregation of Athens.

The following letter was sent to the bishop for publication:

To the Right Rev. John England, Bishop of Charleston

AUGUSTA, Nov. 4th, 1839.

Sir:—I have the honour to communicate the inclosed Resolutions of the Board of Health of this city.

Be assured that I heartily unite with the Board in the expression of grateful thanks for the signal kindness manifested by you in directing the efforts of the Sisters of Charity to the relief of the afflicted of our city.

Guided by the christian spirit of the Rev. Mr. Barry, in the midst of a panic-stricken community, whose pastors fled from their churches and their flocks were scattered abroad, their disinterested devotion to the claims of suffering humanity, presented a beautiful moral spectacle, which made a deep and lasting impression upon the hearts of all who witnessed its exhibition.

I am, Your obedient servant,

A. CUMMING,

Mayor

OFFICE OF THE BOARD OF HEALTH

Augusta, Nov. 4, 1839.—A meeting of the Board of Health took place this day.

The Committee having charge of the temporary Hospital report, that the establishment being no longer necessary, has been discontinued. And, therefore, it was

Resolved unanimously, That the thanks of this Board be tendered to the *Right Rev. Dr. John England*, Bishop of Charleston, for his promptness and liberality, in furnishing aid to our sick poor; to the Rev. John Barry, for the use of his parsonage, and the unremitting attention to the patients, and in particular, to the three Sisters of Charity from Charleston, who have so long and with such constant care, skill and kindness, taken charge of the hospital.

Resolved, That the Mayor be requested to forward copies of the above resolution to the Rt. Rev. Dr. England and to the Rev. Mr. Barry.

And the Board adjourned, to Wednesday next, at 12 o'clock.

A. CUMMING,

Mayor

Samuel Thompson, *Secretary.*

Bishop England answered this letter of the Mayor as follows:

To the Hon. Alfred Cumming,
Mayor of Augusta.

Charleston, Nov. 11, 1839.

Sir:—I was on Saturday honoured with your letter of the 4th covering the preceedings of the Board of Health of Augusta, at their meeting on that day. I beg of you to express to the Board my deep sense of the kind manner in which they appreciate the little which I have been able to contribute towards alleviating the sufferings of your city, for whose welfare I am greatly interested, and to whose citizens I have good reason for being attached. I sympathize with them in their sufferings, I regret that I could not do more to relieve them.

The Rev. Mr. Barry has fully justified my expectations and secured my confidence by the faithful and zealous discharge of his duty. He has well fulfilled the obligation of a pastor, not only in watching over those whom I committed to his charge but in giving up his residence to be the asylum of the diseased and the destitute, and he reports to me in flattering terms the aid which he received in the cheerful co-operation of the Rev. Mr. Cronin, whom I sent to labour under his direction during the period the sickness may continue, but he informs me that their efforts would have been of comparatively little value, had they not been sustained by your devoted exertions and those of your board and the physicians.

The Sisters of Our Lady of Mercy upon my announcing that I wanted three to serve the sick in Augusta, manifested a gratifying emulation, each trusting that she might be one of those sent to the field of labour; and though at the moment we were not without suffering here, they felt, as I did, that your city stood more in need of their exertions. I am gratified at your testimony and that of the Board of Health being so fully in accord with the report of the Pastor. On the other hand, they speak in very grateful terms of the kindness and attention they received at your hands, and from all others engaged in the work of mercy; I may add that their appearance upon their return hither indicates that so far from suffering by their exertions in the cause of Charity, God has blessed them with renovated health to continue in the performance of those duties to which they have so generously devoted themselves for the sake of the Redeemer who laid down his life that we may be saved.

I trust, Sir, that during our lives Augusta will be spared from so severe a chastisement as that which God has inflicted for his own wise purposes in the present year. He frequently chastises, as a father, those whom he loves, though the child will

not always discover the benefit of the affliction. In his own good time also he tempers his severity with consolation and soothing, by the extension of Mercy. Should it however happen that the scourge should be again used, Augusta may feel assured that to the best of our power we shall be ready to prove not in word but in work the sincerity of our affection to all indiscriminately of what creed or colour soever to whom our exertions or sacrifices may be useful.

I trust you will not consider me presumptuous in assuring you of the high place which your own noble conduct amidst the afflictions and desolation of your fine city has given to you in the esteem and regard of

Your obed't humble Servant,

✠ JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

At the First General Convention of the Diocese, held at Charleston, November 17, 1839, Dr. England spoke again of the work being done by the two teaching Communities:

For the purpose of educating female children, of having care of orphans, and of assuaging the sufferings of the sick and aiding towards their recovery, I, about ten years since, formed the congregation of Sisters of Our Lady of Mercy, taking the principles of their rule from that drawn up by St. Vincent of Paul for the Sisters of Charity. Their number has gradually increased, and they have made great progress towards attaining that perfect observance of all those duties, to arrive at which not only humility, charity, and steady habitual correspondence with those graces which God mercifully bestows through Jesus Christ upon his servants, are required; but also a considerable share of experience is necessary. Already have the Sisters earned for themselves the lasting gratitude of numbers upon whom they conferred great benefits, but I trust they have laid deep those foundations of virtue, upon which they may raise a super-structure of usefulness, and secure for themselves the blessings of their God.

In whatever way other Diocesses may exceed us in numbers, in means, in churches, in colleges and in seminaries, I can easily assert that no one of them surpasses us in the possessions of a good institution for the perfect education of young ladies. Five years have nearly elapsed since the Ursuline nuns have come amongst us, and already they have succeeded beyond my expectations.

At what particular period the Dames de la Retraite left Charleston we do not know; but in December, 1839, Madame Hery du

Jarday, their principal or superioress, came to Charleston to conduct a Fair for their academy in St. Augustine, Florida, where they had recently established an Academy for young ladies. It is interesting to see in the announcement of their Fair the qualities of the grape-fruit highly recommended.

Late in December, 1839, preparations were begun for the purchase of the present site of the Academy of Our Lady of Mercy, in Queen Street. Ten Sisters, seventy orphans and twenty poor pupils took possession of the new house on February 16, 1841. The cornerstone of the new Academy was laid on March 26, 1840.

> We hail this event [writes Dr. England], as one of the happiest for religion and humanity that has long occurred in the city, and we are convinced that Charleston will bountifully sustain and enlarge an Institution thus commenced under the auspices of Charity, with a reliance upon God's Providence and the generosity of his people, to cherish the orphan, to console the afflicted, to teach the ignorant and to solace and minister to the victim of disease, especially to the hard working industrious stranger who is by his circumstances bereft of the soothing care of kindred and neighbours. We repeat our confidence that the trust thus placed in the community of Charleston will not be disappointed.

A Fair, which netted about four thousand dollars, was held in April, 1841, to help pay the debt on the new convent. The announcement carries a reminder:

> On a former occasion, our fellow citizens gave a solid earnest of their generous encouragement and support of the Sisters of Mercy. In the day of sickness these nurses regard not the creed or the country of the patient: his distress and bereavement are the best titles to their attention. Augusta has beheld them in the day of her desolation fly upon the wings of charity to her aid; and she expressed the fullness of her gratitude. We trust that the scourge of sickness may be kept from us; but we desire to have amongst us the power of alleviating its infliction and of healing its wounds, should we be again subjected to its severity.

Bishop England sailed from Boston in the *Britannia* on May 6, 1841, and arrived at Cork on June 15, 1841. He was accompanied by the Superioress of the Ursuline Convent, Mother Borgia McCarthy, who went to Ireland for the purpose of selecting subjects for her establishment as the Presentation *Annals* put it—"then so much

in need of them, there being no hope that any of the natives would join them at least for the distant period of half a century!" Cork, Blackrock, and Dublin were visited by Mother Borgia for volunteers, and on September 17, the recruits left with Bishop England, sailing from Liverpool on September 21, and reaching Charleston on December 4, 1841.

After Bishop England's death on April 11, 1842, the two religious Communities suffered as did all Dr. England's projects.

In 1847, Bishop Reynolds decided that there was not sufficient occupation for the two Communities in the diocese, and requested the Ursulines to leave. He had decided to take their house as his episcopal residence. The property rightfully belonged to the Ursulines, since it had been purchased by Bishop England with the dower money the original group brought with them from Ireland. Bishop England neglected to have the house deeded to the nuns, and, since it was not vested in their name, they were obliged to comply with Bishop Reynolds' demand. Later when he realized how the Community had been unjustly deprived of what was really their own property, he deeply regretted the incident.[25] It is said that he exacted a death-bed promise from Dr. Lynch to bring the Ursulines back to the diocese as an act of reparation. Bishop Lynch's sister was a member of the Community at the time, and when he succeeded Dr. Reynolds, in 1858, he established the Ursulines in Columbia, the capital of the State. They refused to return to Charleston.

---

[25]Cf. *The Ursuline Nuns in America*, by E. T. Vogel, in the *Records* (ACHS), vol. I, pp. 214-255. There are three letters from Bishop England in the Archiepiscopal Archives of Quebec on the question of affiliating the Ursulines of Quebec with the community in Charleston. I was told by the present Superioress of the Quebec Convent that their archives contain nothing on this matter. There is no reference to the Charleston nuns in *Glimpses of the Monastery: Scenes from the History of the Ursulines of Quebec during two hundred Years (1639-1839)*, 602 pp. Quebec, 1897. The Charleston Ursulines had distinguished members in their ranks. Sister Borgia McCarthy was the niece of Bishop McCarthy, coadjutor to Bishop Moylan of Cork. Sister Antonia Hughes was the sister of Bishop Hughes of Gibraltar. It was Sister Borgia who compiled the *Ursuline Manual of Prayers*. Mother Angela Delaney who succeeded Mother Charles was the sister of Bishop Delaney of Cork. Some time before Dr. England's death, his niece, Nora, joined the Charleston community. Cf. *Record of Fifty Years of the Springfield Ursulines*. Springfield, 1909.

CHAPTER XXIV

Foreign Catholic Missionary Societies (1822-1842)

The missionary history of the Church can be divided into three periods.[1] The first period is that of the Apostolic Age, when the Apostles and their disciples and later the great missionaries of the nations, St. Patrick, St. Augustine, St. Boniface, Sts. Cyril and Methodius, and others, carried with triumph the message of the Gospel over the known world. The second period commenced with what may be defined as the epoch of an official protectorate over the missions by the Christian governments of the Middle Ages. This epoch closed with the French Revolution. Of the second period, Hickey writes:

> The spiritual and temporal powers of the world cooperated in the work of establishing the Kingdom of God on Earth. The rise of the monastic orders with their ever-increasing missionary activity is one of the outstanding facts in this period. It is true that the exercise of royal protection over the spread of the missionary work brought about certain difficulties between Church and State; and these conflicts have unfortunately cast too large a shadow over medieval civilization. In the earlier part of the middle ages certain inconveniences arose that hindered the success of the Missions; and no doubt a more definite means of cooperation between Church and State in the spread of Christian civilization would have been agreed upon, had not the Protestant Rebellion of the sixteenth century badly shattered the missionary work of the Church. We see one evidence of this in the foundation of the Sacred Congregation de Propaganda Fide in 1622, since its origin can be traced to a period anterior to the so-called Counter-Reformation. For almost a century before the foundation of Propaganda, the Church of God had been blessed with the presence of a religious society founded for the express purpose of spreading the Faith in pagan lands. That the activities of the Society of Jesus were turned rather to the work of salvaging those parts

[1]Monsabré, *Discours en faveur de l'oeuvre de la Propagation de la Foi*, delivered in the Cathedral at Lyons, France. March 20, 1891. Cf. *Missions Catholiques*, vol. XXX, supplement, pp. 1-7, 1898.

> of Christendom which had been lost to the Church in the débâcle of the sixteenth century, is an added evidence to the fact of the permanency of Christian missionary ideals; and the presence of this splendid phalanx of scholars and missionaries, directed by the Sacred Congregation, enables us to understand how, little by little, there would grow up within the Church the idea of an organization which would centralize the interest of the Catholic laity throughout the world in the work of propagating the Faith.[2]

The third period opened with the nineteenth century, and its chief characteristic mark is its direct appeal to the people to support the work of spreading the Gospel. No new note needed to be sounded; for, in reality, this was but a return to the days of the early Christians, when alongside the official teachers of the Church were to be found loyal and generous lay folk ever ready to make sacrifices for Christ and His Kingdom. In the second period certain missionary organizations arose which were destined to survive the French Revolution and to carry their vigorous activity on to our own times. These organizations were of three kinds: for the education of the clergy; for the instruction of the people; and for the support of missionary work, then being accomplished either by the older Religious Orders and Congregations or by the new Religious Communities which sprang from the Catholic reform movement of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

The first of these, both in point of age as well as in honor and prestige, is the Sacred Congregation de Propaganda Fide, the origin of which goes back to the first years of the Catholic Reaction of the sixteenth century. The creation of the Congregation de Propaganda Fide by the Bull *Inscrutabili* of June 22, 1622, may be accepted as the completion of the formative stage of the Counter-Reformation. It was the last of the greater Congregations to be established by the Holy See, and it soon outshone all others by the extraordinary extent of its powers and jurisdiction. It resembled the other Congregations in its organization, but it differed entirely from them in the range of its authority. From the beginning of its existence, the object of the Congregation de Propaganda Fide was definitely understood: it was to regain the faithful in all those

[2]Edward J. Hickey, *The Society for the Propagation of the Faith: its Foundation, Organization and Success* (1822-1922), pp. 6-7. Washington, D. C., 1922.

parts of the world where Protestantism had been established and to bring the light of the true Faith to heathen lands.

To reconquer by spiritual arms, by prayers and good works, by preaching and catechizing, the countries that had been lost to the Church in the sixteenth century, and to organize into an efficient corps the numerous missionary enterprises for the diffusion of the Gospel in pagan lands, were the two distinct objects which soon ranked Propaganda Fide only a little less in dignity than the Universal Church.[3] It was under the direction of Propaganda that a central Catholic missionary college was founded, the famous Collegio Urbano, in the Piazza di Spagna, Rome, in 1627.

Among the religious communities founded during the seventeenth century with the double purpose of educating priests and of establishing missionary work in foreign lands, were: the Congregation of the Mission (Vincentians, Lazarists), founded in Paris by St. Vincent de Paul, in 1625, the history of whose labors in the American Middle West has now passed the century mark; the Society of Saint Sulpice, founded in Paris by Father Olier in 1642, whose seminary in Baltimore was the cradle of clerical education in this country; the Society of Foreign Missions, created in Paris in 1658-1663, whose celebrated seminary in the Rue du Bac has been the training-ground for many of our modern martyrs; and the Congregation of the Holy Ghost, established in Paris in 1703, which assisted the American bishops in founding the Liberian Mission in 1835. These religious institutions made Paris a great center, first for France, and then for the whole world, of a modern apostolate which rivals in its breadth of design and in its successes, the early ages of the Church. The French Revolution halted many of

[3]Cf. Guilday, *The Sacred Congregation de Propaganda Fide (1622-1922)*, in the *Catholic Historical Review*, vol. VI, pp. 478-494. No names deserve to be better known in the history of the Catholic Church in the United States than those of the Cardinals-Prefect of Propaganda. From 1790 until 1908, these were the supreme chiefs under the Popes of Catholic affairs in this country: Antonelli (1780-1795); Gerdil (1795-1802); Borgia (1802-1804); Di Pietro (1805-1814); Quarantotti (Vice-Prefect), in 1814; Litta (1814-1818); Fontana (1818-1822); Consalvi (1822-1824); Della Somaglia (1824-1826); Cappellari (1826-1831); Pedicini (1831-1834); Fransoni (1834-1856); Barnabò (1856-1874); Franchi (1874-1878); Simeoni (1878-1892); Ledochowski (1892-1902); Gotti (1902-1908). The official history of Propaganda will be found in the tercentenary volume: *Terzo Centenario della S. C. de Propaganda Fide*. Rome, 1922.

the missionary works of these Congregations and destroyed many more; but once peace set in at the beginning of the nineteenth century, France again resumed its leadership in the propagation of the Catholic Faith and became the home of other Societies having as their object the support of the missions throughout the world.

The historical evolution of these missionary societies contains many interesting facts and reveals many interesting personages, some of whom belong in a particular way to the American Church. As early as 1632, a society for the purpose of spreading the Faith in Protestant lands seems to have been projected in Paris, and shortly after the establishment of the Seminary in the Rue du Bac, an attempt was made (1665) to create an auxiliary society which would contribute the funds necessary for the Society of Foreign Missions. The founding of the greatest of all Protestant missionary societies, the Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge, in 1698, and its subsidiary organization, the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, in 1701, stirred Catholic activity to renewed efforts in the field; but beyond an Association of Prayers and Good Works for the salvation of infidels, towards the end of the eighteenth century, no successful effort seems to have been made before 1817, when the directors of the Seminary for Foreign Missions reorganized the Association of Prayers, and secured the approval of the Holy See for its plans. It was about this time that Abbé Langlois, one of the Directors of the Seminary, began to publish the news of the foreign missions in a small booklet, which was later issued as the *Nouvelles Lettres Édifiantes*. The means employed by the Association of 1817 were prayer and almsgiving.

When, five years later, in the May of 1822, meetings were held at Lyons of those interested in creating a new organization which would embody the methods of the old Association and place the problem of supporting the foreign missions upon a methodic basis, it was found that several persons had been striving for the same purpose. Three of these persons are given credit for the origin of the Society of the Propagation of the Faith in Lyons in 1822.

The first of these is Pauline-Marie Jaricot, who was born at Lyons in 1799, and to whom popular tradition has accredited the

foundation of the Society. Pauline's brother, Phileas, was a student at the Seminary of Saint Sulpice at the time his sister's interest was aroused in the Society for Foreign Missions. "There had been considerable correspondence between himself and his sister on the subject of a Society which she had founded among pious servant girls who were known as the *Réparatrices du Sacré-Cœur de Jésus-Christ.* After his entrance into Saint Sulpice, he continued his interest in his sister's work and began to secure cooperation in a plan he had for assisting the Seminary for Foreign Missions which he was in the habit of visiting. By this time (1820) Pauline-Marie had fairly well developed her plan of the new Society."[4] It is significant to note in passing that Mlle. Jaricot denied any connection between her plan and the methods used by the Protestant Societies.

The second person in the little group of founders was M. Benoît Coste, a silk merchant at Lyons, whose guidance in the actual foundations of the Society prevented the acceptance of any limited viewpoint in the scope of the work. To him probably belongs the credit for making the work universal in character and world-wide in extent. To these figures in the picture there are others whose names must not be forgotten: Abbé Cholleton, Director of the Seminary of St. Irenaeus of Lyons, the friend of Bishop Du Bourg; the notorious Father Inglesi, whose career is one of the unpleasant chapters in the American Church; Victor Girodon, around whom much of the early history of the Society is centered; and M. Didier Petit de Meurville, who called the foundation meeting on May 3, 1822, and whose influence in the organization of this greatest of all Catholic missionary societies was the dominating one. It is not to these saintly and zealous persons that American interest is attached, but to Petit de Meurville's mother, Madame Petit, the refugee from San Domingo, and to her two close friends, Bishops Flaget and Du Bourg.

In the uprising of 1794 in San Domingo, Madame Petit lost her husband and brother and fled with her son to Baltimore. She had been robbed of everything in the revolution and was obliged to open a school for girls. In this way she became acquainted with the

[4]Hickey, *op. cit.*, pp. 15-16.

Sulpicians at the Seminary, and was fortunate in finding a loyal friend in Father William Du Bourg, who was himself a native of San Domingo. In 1803, Madame Petit's family encouraged her to return to Lyons, and she crossed the Atlantic with the Sulpicians who had been recalled to France by Father Emery, the Superior-General. After establishing a home in Lyons, Madame Petit kept up a correspondence with Flaget and Du Bourg, and when these two priests became bishops, the first in 1808, and the second in 1815, Madame Petit showed her gratitude in many ways. Both prelates knew they might count upon her support for the needs of their dioceses.

After his consecration in Rome, in 1815, Bishop Du Bourg came to Lyons to place before Madame Petit a plan he had formed for his Diocese of Louisiana, then larger than the whole of France. Du Bourg asked Madame Petit to organize a charitable association for Louisiana. On account of her social position in the city, Madame Petit was enabled to secure the cooperation of a number of wealthy Catholics in her designs and among these was M. Benoît Coste. It is apparent from the unpublished letters and documents of the Society of the Propagation of the Faith, that Madame Petit's efforts were successful, though no attempt seems to have been made to organize the collections for Louisiana upon a methodic basis.[5] The work was carried on spasmodically until, towards the end of 1820, there came to Lyons the most startling ecclesiastical adventurer of his day, the Vicar-General of the Diocese of Louisiana, Abbé Inglesi.

Angelo Inglesi was a Roman by birth and had a varied career before reaching St. Louis in 1818 or 1819. He had almost completed his theological studies in the Seminary of Perugia, when the invasion of Italy by Napoleon's army closed that establishment, and for some years afterwards, Inglesi was a soldier in a British regiment. It would seem that he was stationed with troops in Canada, when his period of enlistment was finished, and that he travelled through the United States as a tourist. He was ready to

[5]There is no doubt that Du Bourg's share in the formation of the Society of the Propagation of the Faith was a principal one, but unfortunately this cannot be proved because the New Orleans diocesan archives suffered much loss during the Civil War. (Cf. *Catholic Historical Review*, vol. I, p. 64).

embark for Europe from New Orleans, when he heard of Bishop Du Bourg's establishment in upper Louisiana (St. Louis) and decided to visit that prelate before leaving. A strong bond of affection arose between the two men. After some months spent in a review of his theological studies, Bishop Du Bourg ordained him in March, 1819, and then decided to send him to Europe to solicit funds for the Diocese of Louisiana and especially for the missions among the Indians. Father Holweck has gathered the data for Inglesi's exceptionally successful journey through Europe and of the amounts he collected from the Kings of France, Holland, and Sardinia, and from the Emperors of Russia and Austria, as well as from the Holy Father himself. In all Inglesi received about 124,000 francs, of which amount, deducting his expenses, Bishop Du Bourg was given about 96,000 francs.[6]

One of Inglesi's first successes was his *Notice sur l'état actuel de la Mission de la Louisiane*, which was published at Paris in 1820. Inglesi's plan was to center around Madame Petit and her son a permanent organization for the support of the Louisiana Missions. In April, 1822, he was in Lyons for the purpose of completing his organization, and while there met Coste, who at that very time was helping Mademoiselle Jaricot to perfect her own plans. The various projects were represented at the first meeting of May 3, 1822, and from this arose the Society for the Propagation of the Faith. Father Inglesi represented Madame Petit's organization; Girodon was the spokesman for Mademoiselle Jaricot; and Coste was the founder of the united group. Some time afterwards, Didier Petit went to Paris to form a Superior Council in order to have a representative at the capital. The two Councils of Lyons and Paris worked in harmony from the beginning. *The Association de la Propagation de la Foi*, as it was officially known, had for its unique object to aid by its prayers and its alms the Catholic missionaries charged with the duty of preaching the Gospel in foreign countries.

Inglesi's subsequent career was short. Du Bourg's announcement that he had ordained the young Italian brought a sharp reprimand

---

[6]Holweck, *Contribution to the Inglesi Affair*, in the *St. Louis Catholic Historical Review*, vol. V, pp. 14-39.

from Propaganda that he had violated one of the severest laws of the Church, namely, that of the constitution (*Speculatores*) of Innocent XII of 1694 which forbade any bishop to ordain a foreign subject unless he had ten years' domicile in the diocese, and had presented *litterae testimoniales* from the bishop of his native place. Propaganda, however, realized that Du Bourg had acted in ignorance of the law, and so absolved him and Father Inglesi from the penalties involved in the ordination. The decree of absolution is dated July 9, 1821.[7] At this particular moment, Inglesi was in Laibach, attending the Congress, where he presented the cause of the Louisiana Mission to the assembled sovereigns and princes. On September 21, 1821, Cardinal Consalvi, Secretary of State, wrote to Propaganda that he had received alarming reports from the Roman police and from the Vicariate about Inglesi, and that Propaganda should investigate the collections of money he was making in Europe.[8] The nuncios of Vienna and Paris were warned that these collections should be forbidden until an investigation into Inglesi's character was made. Inglesi's spectacular reception by the sovereigns assembled at Laibach disturbed Consalvi, who saw political danger in the Louisiana priest's success. The following day, Propaganda wrote to Du Bourg that, although the Sacred Congregation regretted adding to his burdens, he should know the truth about Inglesi, whom Du Bourg had by this time chosen as co-adjutor-bishop of his diocese.

From this time on, Propaganda's letters to Bishop Du Bourg carry a warning of Inglesi's turpitude. Bishop Plessis wrote from Quebec, March 5, 1823, giving details about Inglesi's career in Canada, which ended all doubt about the serious charges made against him. The revelation was a serious blow to Bishop Du Bourg, and contributed, as we have seen, to his determination to resign the See of New Orleans.[9] Inglesi is next seen in Philadelphia, where the schism was then at its height. He left Philadelphia for the West Indies in 1823, and died at Port-au-Prince, San Domingo, on June 13, 1825, whilst ministering, it is said, to the victims of the cholera.

---

[7]Prop. Arch., *Lettere*, vol. 302, fol. 315.
[8]*Ibid.*, fol. 443.
[9]Printed in the *St. Louis Cath. Hist. Review.*, vol. V, pp. 15-17.

The missions of Asia and of the United States were the chief recipients at this time of the sums collected by the Society of Lyons-Paris. During the first years of its existence the correspondence between the Central Council and Bishops Flaget, Du Bourg, Fenwick of Cincinnati, and Rosati, and with French missionaries in the United States, brought out clearly to the readers of the *Annales* of the Society the great need of supporting the missions in this country. In one of the first numbers of the *Annales,* an account is given of the American hierarchy, and the names of the French Bishops, Maréchal, Cheverus, Flaget, David, and Du Bourg, who were struggling against such strong odds in the United States, were an added incentive to French piety and generosity towards the Society. It was not long after the foundation of the Society that the nine bishops, comprising the hierarchy here, began to look to Lyons and Paris as the one dependable source of financial assistance in their diocesan work. The correspondence between the American dioceses and Lyons during the first eight years of the Society's existence (1822-1830) is among the most valuable we possess for American Church history.[10] In these letters and in the replies sent by the Society, it is evident that from the beginning no distinction was made between the French and the non-French bishops here in the matter of subsidies. In fact, the two Fenwicks appear to have influenced the Society more than the others. Among the most frequent American correspondents with the Petit family and especially with Madame Petit's son, Didier Petit, who was Secretary of the Society, was Frederic Rese.

Rese was born probably in Hildesheim in 1793, was of age at the time of the Napoleonic invasions, and served under Blücher at Waterloo. After peace came, he entered the Collegio Urbano, and was ordained to the priesthood in 1822. Shea says that he was sent to the African missions, but his health failed and he returned to Rome. Here he was presented to Bishop Fenwick of Cincinnati, who had arrived in Rome, on September 26, 1823, and he was one

[10]Cf. Hickey's critical essay on the sources for the history of the Lyons-Paris Society (*op. cit.*, pp. 163-182). The *Annales de la Propagation de la Foi* began in 1822, the first number containing a valuable account of the Louisiana and Kentucky missions. Vol. I contains the letters and reports for the years 1822-1826. Volumes appeared at irregular intervals after that until 1840, when annual volumes began.

of the little band of missionaries who accompanied the saintly Bishop of Cincinnati to the United States in 1824. Dr. Fenwick appointed Father Rese his secretary and the two clergymen set out early in 1824, by way of Florence, Genoa and Paris, for Liverpool. Some time in May, they reached Lyons. O'Daniel says that during his sojourn in Rome and on his journeys Fenwick wore the white habit of his order, and that his courage aroused considerable admiration in France. "He was most likely the first person who had dared to appear publicly in that country in the venerable garb of St. Dominic, since the abolition of Religious Orders by the iniquitous laws of the French Revolution, more than thirty years before."[11]

The *Annales* contain several accounts of the welcome given to the two travellers by the Association in Lyons. As the first American Bishop to visit the Central Council, Dr. Fenwick won the sympathy of all the officials, and brought before them clearly the needs of the Church in the United States. Father Rese did not miss the opportunity of learning the plan and organization of the Society, and his knowledge of its methods enabled him later to found the Societies of Munich and Vienna upon the same successful model.

In 1827, Bishop Fenwick sent Father Rese to Europe to secure further assistance for the then vast Diocese of Cincinnati. In a letter written by Bishop Fenwick (Cincinnati, January 20, 1827), addressed to the Grand Almoner of the Association, and given to Father Rese for presentation at Lyons, we learn that each year since his visit in 1824, the Diocese of Cincinnati had been generously helped by the Society. One of the principal purposes of Rese's visit was to obtain missionaries, particularly those who knew German as well as English. Meanwhile Father Rese had been considering the possibility of extending the work of the Society of the Propagation of the Faith to Bavaria and Austria. On July 1, 1827, he wrote from Rome to Didier Petit, that if he should succeed the two organizations would be constituted as branches of the Central Council of Lyons. Rese recognized that political difficulties might arise over the establishment of a French society in the two foreign capitals, owing to the fact that the moneys collected in Bavaria and

[11]O'Daniel, *Fenwick*, p. 257.

Austria would be distributed by French officials. Rese spent practically a year in Rome, debating over the problem of a religious vocation with the Dominicans, as Father Stephen Badin had done two years before. Leaving Rome on May 28, 1828, he went north to Munich and Vienna to bring the needs of the Cincinnati Diocese to the Courts of those capitals.

At Munich, Father Rese appealed to King Louis I for permission to found a Society, similar to that of Lyons, with the purpose of assisting the American missions and those in the East. Very little has been written on the history of this Society, which was called after the King the *Ludwigmissionsverein.*[12] Practically all the funds collected during the first decade of its existence, about 26,000 marks, were sent to the Diocese of Cincinnati. A reorganization of the Munich Society was suggested by Father Rese to King Louis on April 22, 1838, and the Society was then extended by royal order to the whole kingdom. Its new constitution resembled that of the Vienna Society. For a time (1838-1844) the Munich Society dispensed its funds partly through the Sacred Congregation de Propaganda Fide and partly through the Society of the Propagation of the Faith of Lyons. A royal decree of July 9, 1844, ordered that this method was henceforth to cease, owing to the fact that the King had decided to make the *Ludwigmissionsverein* "for the Universal Church" and not "an instrument of French politics". The *Annales* of the Lyons Society were published in German in Bavaria from 1829 to 1844. After 1828, the Munich Society published its own *Annalen der Verbreitung des Glaubens,* and after 1849, letters from the American missions began to appear in its pages. Before long the *Annalen* were devoted almost exclusively to reports and letters from the German missionaries in the United States. Up to the Civil War Munich had sent over three million marks to the American dioceses. What the St. Louis Society con-

[12] *Ibid.,* p. 265. No history of the St. Louis Society has been published. The *Annalen der Verbreitung des Glaubens* which were based upon the Lyons *Annales* were published from 1848 to 1918. There are about seventy volumes in all. Several sermons delivered on the anniversaries of the St. Louis Mission Society are in print. Rev. Joseph A. Schabert, Ph. D., has given a list of all the available sources in his article: *The Ludwig-Missionsverein,* in the *Catholic Historical Review,* vol. VIII (April, 1922), pp. 23-41. Cf. Lamott, *History of the Archdiocese of Cincinnati,* p. 188. Cincinnati, 1921.

tributed to the support of Catholicism in America during the years under review (1828-1842) cannot be told with accuracy, owing to the lack of printed documents.[13]

There is a reference to the Bavarian Society in Dr. England's Address to the Tenth South Carolina Convention (November, 1833):

> It was only upon my arrival in Bavaria, that I began to discover how much our churches are indebted to that excellent and zealous prelate, Doctor Rese, lately placed in the newly-erected see of Detroit. The mischievous enactments of several of the German princes had, amongst other evils, long dammed up the current of alms in the Catholic Church. For purposes to which it is not now my province to advert, the state had prohibited its subjects from giving any benefaction or aid to any person or institution within its territory. Many of the Catholics of Germany, learning from emigrants the deplorable situation in which they found themselves at this side of the Atlantic, were anxious to help them in erecting churches and procuring a clergy. The Reverend Doctor Rese visited his native country for the purpose of exposing to the view of its inhabitants the difficulties and the wants thus felt, and entreating their aid for removing them. The zeal of the people urged them to contribute; but the law of the land forbade the contribution. At Munich, he after considerable exertion, succeeded in having that law so far relaxed, as to permit one contribution to be made and transmitted. The venerable archbishop of that See had the amount forwarded to the association in Paris, to be distributed amongst our churches; but owing to some cause, it had not reached that city, when I was there, or, at least, if it did, it had not been received by the council of the association. And though Bavaria has been charitable, we have not been aided. I have requested the council of Paris, to have further inquiry made upon the subject, and our late provincial council have desired that letters should also be written to the proper quarters for an elucidation. It is surmised by some that the money arrived in Paris at a period of considerable excitement,

---

[13]On July 29, 1925, I wrote to Cardinal Faulhaber, Archbishop of Munich, asking for information on this point. His Eminence placed my request before Dr. Neuhäusler, President of the Ludwigmissionsverein, and on September 1, 1925, I received from the central bureau of the Society the following facts: Between 1828 and 1838, there were very few documents in the Society's archives on the receipts and expenditures of this first decade. The total receipts, it would appear, from 1828 to 1838, were 20,548 gulden, or 35,156 goldmark. From 1839 to 1845 (the period of the amalgamation with Lyons) the total amount collected in Bavaria was 181,727 marks. Cf. *Die Ludwig-Missionsverein in Bayern*, by Dr. Neuhäusler, in the *Katholische Missionen*, March, 1921.

and was thus impeded in its progress to the American churches.[14]

Father Rese spent over a year in the Austrian capital, where he arrived in August, 1828. After several months of negotiations, he succeeded in having his plan for an Austrian missionary society, similar to that of Lyons, presented to the Emperor Francis I. To arouse public interest in the project, he published at Vienna, in 1829, his *Abriss der Geschichte von Cincinnati in Nord-Amerika.* This pamphlet of about fifty pages, was modelled upon the historical essay: *Origine et Progrès de la Mission du Kentucky*, which Father Badin published in the *Ami de la Religion* of Paris in 1821. The *Abriss* was sent by imperial request to all the clergy of the Empire.[15] On October 28, 1828, Father Rese was again received by the Emperor, and the plans for the Vienna Society, to be called the *Leopoldinische Stiftung*, in honor of Leopoldina, Empress of Brazil and the Emperor's favorite daughter. Archduke Rudolph, the Cardinal Archbishop of Olmütz and brother of Francis I, became the Protector of the Association, and the Prince-Archbishop of Vienna, Leopold Maximilian von Firmian, was appointed its first President. The bureau of the Association was placed in the Dominican monastery of Vienna. In the unpublished documents from the *Haus-Hof-und Staats-Archiv* of Vienna the gradual evolution of the Statutes of the Association shows clearly that in no way was the new missionary society to be formed for political or national purposes.[16] The end in view was to be wholly spiritual, namely, the support of the American missions by prayers and alms. The system adopted closely resembled the Lyons Society, and for a time there was thought of affiliating the Vienna Association to Lyons. The Holy See was asked to give its approval to the

---

[14]*Works* (Messmer), vol. VII, p. 123.

[15]For an interesting effect of this pamphlet, cf. Rezek, *History of the Diocese of Sault Ste. Marie and Marquette*, vol. I, pp. 29-32. Houghton (Mich.), 1906.

[16]An unpublished MS, *The Leopoldine Association and its Work in Ohio (1829-1840)*, (72 pp.), by the late Rev. Raymond Payne, of Louisville, is in the Library of the Catholic University of America. Cf. Rezek, *The Leopoldine Society,* in the *Acta et Dicta* of the Catholic Historical Society of St. Paul, vol. III, pp. 305-320. Original documents in my possession (about 40) from the Vienna Archives supplement all that has been published on the Society. On the Empress Leopoldine, cf. Seidler, *Brasiliens Kriegs-und Revolutions-Geschichte seit dem Jahre 1825 bis auf unsere Zeit.* Leipzig, 1837.

project, and by the Bull *Quamquam plura* of January 30, 1829, Pope Leo XII sanctioned the work. There is no mention of the United States in the *Quamquam plura.*[17]

Meanwhile, as is evident from the unpublished sources mentioned above, Prince Metternich wrote to the Consul-General of Austria at New York, Freiherr von Lederer, requesting him to ascertain full particulars about Father Rese and the conditions prevailing in the Church in the United States, and especially in the Diocese of Cincinnati. In several paragraphs of the correspondence which followed between von Lederer and Vienna, the hope is expressed that by means of the charity shown to the struggling Church in America, the Catholics of Austria would be awakened to a new spirit of devotion towards the Sacraments and towards the Holy See. On April 27, 1829, Metternich wrote to Prince Esterhazy, the Austrian Ambassador in London, and to Count Anton Appony, who held the same post in Paris, bespeaking their interest in Father Rese's projects, and advising them that any letters sent to Vienna by way of London or Paris were to be sent at once to the bureau of the Association.

On May 13, 1829, under the chairmanship of the Prince-Archbishop of Vienna, the first meeting of the new Association was held. Rev. Joseph Pletz, Canon of the Cathedral of St. Stephen, read an eloquent paper on the needs of the American Church, in which he said:

> In this Empire everything that is great, beautiful and noble prospers, so that we are justified in believing that the people of so great a monarchy will also cooperate in making known everywhere the Holy Name of our Redeemer; that they will flock in great numbers to join a society intended to render the nations of distant North America a great service by opening to them the road to religion and civilization. Who of us was not moved by the simple yet remarkable narrative of Rev. Frederic Rese, an alumnus of the Propaganda, and now Vicar-General of Cincinnati, who during his stay of several months in Vienna portrayed to us the status of his diocese, the last erected in America. . . . He explained what quick progress the Catholic Church was making in America; that since 1823 the number of souls [in the diocess of Cincinnati] has grown to 40,000.

[17] *Juris Pontificii de P. F.* (De Martinis), vol. IV, pp. 709-710. Rome, 1892.

> We learned with sorrow that these 40,000 souls are scattered over a territory much larger than France, and that there are only sixteen priests available for divine service and for the administration of the sacraments, many of them making more than eighty miles, at times, to comfort the dying. . . . This plain, yet true exposition of the state of the American missions will suffice. God who guides the hearts of men sends a ray of His Holy Spirit and lo! there is formed a society whose aim it shall be to succor the missions in their most urgent needs. Our most gracious Emperor has confirmed it and approved of its statutes; the head of the Church has sanctioned it by imparting to its members indulgences in the name of Jesus Christ . . . Thus flourishes this Society under the protection of the state and with the blessings of the Church, hoping to do great things if we may judge from the interest of the different nations of the monarchy toward it.[18]

The Statutes of the Society were voted upon and together with Canon Pletz's paper were published in a small brochure in German, Italian and Latin. Unlike the Lyons Society, the Leopoldine Association was founded exclusively to aid the Church in the United States. No appeal for alms was to be made outside the dioceses of the Austrian empire. The clergy of Austria and Hungary made a special appeal to their flocks on the Feast of St. Leopold for contributions. It has been estimated that within the first decade of its existence (1829-1838), the Leopoldine Association sent about $220,000 to the American missions, besides many religious articles, such as missals, chalices, copes, vestments, oil stocks, paintings, bells, altar linens, crucifixes, etc.

Father Rese had by this time spent about three years in Europe. He was free now to return, since these two organizations had been founded through his efforts for the direct support of the American Church. He reached Cincinnati on December 17, 1829, and on January 15, 1830, Bishop Fenwick wrote to Francis I, expressing his profound appreciation of all that the Emperor had done to supply "the urgent needs of our poor missions and our new dioceses". On April 27, Metternich replied:

> The Emperor, steadfastly devoted to our holy Religion, feels a keen sense of joy at the news that the truth is making such rapid strides in the vast country of North America. Convinced

[18] *Berichte*, vol. I (1831), pp. 5-7.

> of the irresistible power which Catholic teaching must exercise over simple and pure hearts and minds, when its truths are expounded by truly apostolic missionaries, His Imperial Majesty entertains the most favorable hopes for the great progress which our holy Religion must make in the United States and among the Indian tribes. The Emperor commissions me to tell Your Lordship that he cheerfully permits his people to contribute towards the support of the Catholic Church in America, in accordance with the plans proposed by your worthy Vicar-General, Rev. Frederic Rese.

No less than thirty-three dioceses are represented in the receipts of the first year, which amounted to about 50,000 florins. In order to keep its members in touch with the American missions and to stimulate their generosity, the Leopoldine Association began in 1831 the publication of its *Berichte* or Reports.

At first, it would seem that the distribution of the money was being guided by interests wholly Austrian or German; but the principle followed by the officers of the Association was to center its assistance upon one city and to put the Catholic institutions of that place upon a firm foundation and not to distribute the funds in small amounts to many churches, where the results would not be immediately visible. The wider distribution of the funds dates from Bishop England's visit to Vienna in 1833.

On October 1, 1831, the Association sent to Bishop Fenwick an additional subsidy of 7,000 florins making 22,580 for that year. The dioceses of St. Louis, Bardstown, Philadelphia and Charleston received each 10,000 florins. In 1832, Fenwick received 30,000 florins; three thousand florins were given to the Redemptorists of Maria Steiger for their journey to the United States; and Archbishop Whitfield was given 20,000 florins. In 1833 the distribution was as follows: Charleston, 10,000 florins; Mobile, 10,000; St. Louis, 5,000; Boston, 5,000; Cincinnati, 2,000. From this time until Dr. England's death in 1842, the Diocese of Charleston figures among those most generously aided by the Association.[19] This was due not only to Dr. England's personal appeals to the Leopoldine officials but also to his long and detailed *History of the Catholic*

[19] *Works* (Reynolds), vol. III, pp. 246-262. For example, on May 10, 1832, Dr. England acknowledged by letter to Bishop Fenwick of Cincinnati the receipt of $4542.61, sent to Charleston by Rese (Catholic Archives of America, Notre Dame).

Church in the United States of North America, presented to the Prince-Archbishop of Vienna, the President of the Association, in March, 1833.[20]

We possess five sketches of this kind from Dr. England's pen. These are: 1, *Brief Account of the Introduction of the Catholic Religion into the States of North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia, and of the Creation of the Diocess of Charleston,* which Dr. England published in pamphlet form in Dublin in 1832, during his first journey to Rome; 2, his *Ragguaglio of the Diocese of Charleston,* presented to Cardinal Pedicini, dated Rome, January 19, 1833; 3, the *Mission de Charleston,* sent to the Society of Lyons, on January 30, 1833, and published in the *Annales* for 1833; 4, the *History* mentioned above; and 5, his *Communication to the Central Council for the Propagation of the Faith at Lyons,* dated Rome, September 29, 1836, which will be treated in a separate chapter. The fourth of these documents, the longest, is that contained in the Report of the Leopoldine Association for 1833.

The Vienna document, which has never been translated, consists of a general introduction on the beginnings of Catholicism in the Thirteen Colonies, the growth of the Church through the Colonial period, followed by a short sketch of the rise of the hierarchy in the United States. This is followed by ten chapters on the Dioceses of Baltimore (pp. 17-20); Boston (pp. 20-23); New York (pp. 23-24); Philadelphia (pp. 25-26); Bardstown (pp. 26-31); Charleston (pp. 33-37); Cincinnati (pp. 37-40); St. Louis (pp. 40-42), and Mobile (pp. 42-43). Nine pages are then devoted to missionary work among the Indians and the colored. An appendix is given, containing the amounts contributed up to that date by the Vienna Association, and six charts bring this interesting document to a close.

Two purposes urged him to write this long historical account of the American Church; first to offer it in thanksgiving to the Leopoldine Association for the generous subsidy sent to Charleston that year; and secondly to place before the Association an exact

[20] *Übersicht des Zustandes und der Fortschritte der katholischen Kirche in den Vereinigten Staaten von Nordamerika, dargestellt in einem Schreiben des Hochwürdigsten Herrn Bischofs von Charleston, Doctor Johann England,* in the *Berichte,* vol. VI (1833), 52 pp.

mirror of conditions in the United States. These conditions were not known in Vienna. Before leaving the imperial city, he believed it to be his duty to write this retrospect of the progress made by the Catholic Church in America up to that time. Dr. England sums up the Catholic history of the Colonies (to the year 1783) in a sweeping sentence: "Before the American Revolution the English Penal Code against the followers of Catholic doctrine was not only in full force, but was also in general applied with rigor to the few Catholics in these Provinces." He asked his readers to weigh well the fifty years which had passed since America became a nation (1783-1833) and to compare the little group of 25,000 Catholics at the beginning of that period, living principally in Maryland and Pennsylvania, with the great Church which existed at the moment he was writing, and to realize above all that this tremendous progress had been made in the very teeth of an intolerant spirit which spared no doctrine or discipline of Catholicism. The one cry, common to American Protestantism, was that the Catholic Church and democracy as viewed by the American Constitution were incompatible. One fact should not be hidden in the midst of the expansion of Catholicism—"how insecure, how humiliating has been the situation of the faithful for more than thirty years in the United States."

The trend of the older population into the Middle West and the drive on Mexico through Texas to the Gulf are then described with a masterly insight into the future social and religious conditions created by the changing frontier. The influx of the newcomers from various parts of Europe, particularly from Great Britain and Ireland, had created another problem for the Church which was causing practical difficulties owing to the scarcity of priests. The blocking of the ever-increasing stream of immigration by the presence of the slaves in the Southern States was leaving that section of the Union not exactly stagnant but essentially unchanged. Nowhere in America was the outlook for Catholicism so bereft of hope as in the South Atlantic States. The growth of the hierarchy spelt the history of the United States, and the dates of the erection of our Sees should be interpreted in the light of the growth of the population: Charleston in 1820; Cincinnati in 1822; St. Louis in 1826; and Mobile in 1829. All eyes were on the old North-

west, where Detroit would soon become a See, and on the heart of the old French country, with Vincennes growing in ecclesiastical importance.

Ten short chapters follow this general history of Catholic progress. Beginning with Baltimore, Dr. England gives in detail geographical, chronological and social facts by which the officials of the Association might decide upon the relative needs of each diocese. There were (1833) about 80,000 Catholics in the Diocese of Baltimore, out of a population of 1,697,737. The Diocese of New York, with a population of 2,073,987, had probably 80,000 Catholics. The Diocese of Philadelphia, with 1,584,711, numbered 11,000 Catholics. The Diocese of Bardstown had a population of 1,872,923 with about 3,000 Catholics. The Diocese of New Orleans in whose limits were lower Louisiana and Mississippi, counted 13,200, in a population of 352,597. "Von der Diöcese Charleston ist nur wenig zu sagen", he adds. There were 40,000 slaves in the city of Charleston, and of these about 5,000 were Catholics. In the three States included in his diocese, Dr. England had less than 11,000 Catholics, in a population of nearly 2,000,000. The importance of Ohio as a political and religious center is graphically described in figures, which, if not quite accurate, are near enough to the census to make the growth of that State striking:

in 1790	3,000	inhabitants
in 1800	45,365	"
in 1810	230,760	"
in 1820	581,434	"
in 1830	937,679	"

—so that in forty years the population of Ohio had increased considerably. The Diocese of Cincinnati [Ohio and the Michigan Territory] had a population of 983,807 in 1833, and of this number 40,000 were Catholics. St. Louis had under its jurisdiction Missouri, the Arkansas Territory and part of the States of Illinois and Indiana. There were 4,000 Catholics in the city of St. Louis. Altogether out of 170,467 inhabitants in the Diocese of St. Louis, the Catholics were reckoned as close to 40,000. In the Diocese of Mobile (Alabama-Florida) there were about 8,000 Catholics in a population of 343,931.

The total number of priests in the United States is given as 293.

Apart from the Catholics in these ten dioceses, Dr. England called the attention of the Prince-Archbishop to the great number of Catholic Indians who had been for years neglected by the Church, owing to the scarcity of missionaries. Everywhere the priests went, they found Catholics who had not seen a priest in ten, twenty or thirty years; and so, the *History* ends upon an eloquent note to all the members of the Association to renew their interest in the struggling Church of Amercia. The charts which follow are:

1. Protestant Seminaries for theological studies in the United States.
2. Protestant Missionary Societies in the United States.
3. Colleges and Universities in the United States where scarcely a single Catholic teacher is to be found, and where the whole intellectual drift is against Catholicism.
4. Catholic Colleges and Seminaries.
5. General Conspectus of the Church (by dioceses) in the United States (1832).

On his return to the United States, Dr. England spoke to the Fathers of the Second Provincial Council on the untold possibilities for spiritual and financial aid in all three of these foreign Catholic missionary societies. With the help of Dr. Rese, who had been consecrated a few weeks before as Bishop of Detroit, Dr. England explained the methods of the Leopoldine Association. At the close of the Council, Archbishop Whitfield wrote to the Prince-Archbishop of Vienna (October 28, 1833), thanking the Association for its generosity in the name of the American Hierarchy. What was needed most, Dr. Whitfield said, was Seminaries for the education of a native clergy. "Churches will be built, and schools will be erected", but there was no medium between them and the people because there were not enough priests.

From a financial viewpoint the American Church was able to look forward from the year 1833-34 to a constant and even an increasing support from Lyons-Paris, Munich and Vienna. What these three Societies did for the Catholics in the United States has never been fully told. The very immensity of their charity, the wide-flung range of their cooperation has loomed so large, even in their printed *Reports* and *Annals*, that no American historian has had the courage to canvass the social and religious facts they contain for our history. Here and there in Provincial Councils a

letter would be written by the hierarchy to thank the Catholics of France and Belgium, of Germany and Austria, for their liberality towards the churches and schools, orphan asylums and hospitals which were then being built by the people of those nations whose sons and daughters had become citizens of the great Republic of the West. The fact needs to be emphasized that in these printed materials lies hidden one of the truest pictures we possess of the faith, hope and charity of the Catholic Church.

Besides these three main streams of charity into the cities and broad plains of the United States, there were others which cannot be forgotten. The Sacred Congregation de Propaganda Fide never failed to assist the bishops here in as far as its funds would permit. Other dioceses in the United States came often to the succor of a sister diocese, as did the American Church to the rescue of Charleston after the great fire of 1838. The vicinity of well-established Churches, like those of Canada, Cuba, Mexico and South America, naturally gave rise to collection tours, which go as far back in our history as the building of the first church in New York City in 1784-1785. The Kings of France and Spain sent not only money to the struggling American Catholics, but also pictures of great value for the adornment of churches and cathedrals. The Popes gave liberally of their charity to worthy causes, such as the establishment of St. Charles College in 1832. There were also individual gifts like that of Sir John James of England, whose "Lancaster Fund" was a source of revenue to the Bishops of Philadelphia for so many years. Father John Baptist Joeffroy of Vienna gave a legacy to Cincinnati which was used to educate two young Ottawa Indians for the priesthood at Propaganda. Father Sebastian Bilinek, a priest of Moravia, bequeathed his estate to the American missions; there are many others, too numerous to mention. The main altar of the Cathedral of Baltimore was the gift of the priests of Marseilles to Archbishop Maréchal. There were interesting paintings sent to what was practically the wilderness, Cincinnati and Bardstown, which attracted visitors from far and near. Ecclesiastical libraries, now the pride of some of our American dioceses, were begun with the gifts of priests, such as that of Father Orsini, who sent seventy-two volumes of the classics to St. Charles Seminary, Philadelphia, in 1833.

The extent of this charity did not escape the notice of those who were becoming anxious over the growth of Catholicism in the Republic, and especially of those who were then building up the Middle West. Protestant religious journals of this decade (1825-1835) were insistent on the danger there was to the Valley in this charity, which they believed could not be given so generously without subtle political motives behind it. It must not be forgotten that all this charitable work was being done in the era of a Metternich.

The third decade of the century was a time of sharp bitterness towards the Catholic Church in this country. The Act of Emancipation (1829) had as great a reaction in anti-Catholic circles as it had among the anti-Irish groups. With few political barriers between the ambitions of a people freed from political, social and religious shackles, after almost three centuries of an ascendency which seldom wavered in its design to keep at least one portion of the Catholic world subjugated to its power, there was naturally a feeling of disquiet, the disquiet of a conscience awakened at last to its ignominious conduct towards its fellowmen. The "Friends of Irish Freedom" which existed in all our large centres were then disbanding with the surety of a great cause won at last for civilization; but the attitude of thousands in America was one of fear of the possibilities in a race which had in spite of penal code and rack and gibbet held the attention of the civilized world. Statesmen realized that there could be no peace in Great Britain and Ireland until the Catholic Question was settled. The settlement of that Question, honorably as it had been brought to its term by the Parliament of Westminster, left these forebodings not only intact but in some parts of the world, especially in the United States, more intense than ever.

There are many aspects to the anti-Catholicism of the period which dates from the beginning of the Jacksonian era to the Mexican War. Various types of movements against the "foreigner" can be traced in these years (1829-1848). Some are distinctly political; others are racial; while others again, particularly those managed by Baptist and Presbyterian ministers of the Gospel, are admixtures of politics, racial feeling and religious belief. These

movements are, however, too largely social in character to be dismissed with such terms as bigotry and intolerance. There was abroad in the country a prejudice against the Catholic Church, so intense in its religious aspect, that no quarter was given to the doctrines of Catholicism; and so widespread in its activity that the Protestant religious press was almost exclusively devoted during these years to a determined effort to create a permanent national opposition to the spread of Popery.

Among the leaders of the anti-Catholic movement of 1830-1833 must be reckoned Samuel B. Morse, the inventor of the telegraph (1844). In 1834, Morse published in the New York *Journal of Commerce* a series of papers, which were later issued under the title: *Imminent Dangers to the Free Institutions of the United States through Foreign Immigration and the Present State of the Naturalization Laws.* The "one great opposing cause" which was embarrassing "the benevolent operations of the country" was foreign immigration. "How is it possible", he asks in the preface to this pamphlet, "how is it possible that foreign turbulence imported by ship-loads, that riot and ignorance in hundreds of thousands of human priest-controlled machines, should suddenly be thrown into our society, and not produce here turbulence and excess: Can one throw sand into pure water and not disturb its clearness?" But there were other causes which gave support, strength, and systematic operation to all these adverse effects of foreign immigration. To one of these, he believed, it was "high time that every American should seriously turn his thoughts". This was the necessity of "a true, American party, uniting Americans of every party", to ward off a blow aimed at the very foundations of our government.

Morse's thesis is this: the action and the influence of American democratic ideals upon European nations—"*directly* in England, France, Spain, Portugal, and Belgium, and *indirectly* in all other European countries", will virtually bring a reaction from Europe. This reaction was already in motion. Frederick Schlegel, a devoted Catholic and a member of the Austrian Cabinet of Vienna, had expressed the great truth that "the political revolutions to which European governments have been so long subjected, from the popular desire for liberty, are the natural effects of the Protestant

Reformation. . . . . The first nursery of these distinctive principles, the great revolutionary school for France and for the rest of Europe, is North America."

Austria, Morse believed, had decided to take action against the nursery itself. Her very existence, politically-speaking, depended upon her ridding the world of such a tremendous evil as the spread of American republican ideas. She could not, however, attack us; she could not send arms and soldiers. But she could send, Morse says, something far more formidable to our American liberties—Popery, the natural antagonist of the glorious fruits of the Protestant Reformation and therefore the enemy to its greatest achievement, American Independence:

> Is not her most obvious act *to send Popery to this country if it is not here, or give it a great and vigorous impulse if it is already here?* At any rate *she is doing it.* She has set herself to work with all her activity to disseminate throughout the country the *Popish religion.* Immediately after the delivery of Schlegel's lectures, which was in the year 1828, a great society was formed in the Austrian capital, in Vienna, in 1829. The late Emperor, and Prince Metternich, and the Crown Prince (now Emperor) and all the civil and ecclesiastical officers of the empire, with the princes of Savoy and Piedmont uniting in it and calling it after the name of a canonized King, *St. Leopold.* This society is formed for a great and express purpose. It has all the officers of government interested in it, from the Emperor down to the humblest in the Empire; and what is this purpose? Why, that *of promoting the greater activity of Catholic missions in America*; these are the words of their own reports. Yes; these Foreign despots are suddenly stirred up to combine and promote the greater activity of Popery in this country; and this, too, just after they had been convinced of the truth, or more properly speaking, had their memories quickened with it that *Popery is utterly opposed to Republican liberty.* These are the facts on the case, Americans, explain them in your own way. If any choose to stretch their charity so far as to believe that these crowned gentlemen have combined in this Society solely for *religious* purposes; that they have organized a Society to collect moneys to be spent in this country, and have sent Jesuits as their almoners, and shiploads of Roman Catholic emigrants, and for the sole purpose of converting us to the *religion* of Popery, and without any *political* design, credat Judaeus Appella, non ego.

The next chapter of the pamphlet is devoted to the following points: "The extent of the St. Leopold Foundation—Jesuits—Their character—Their tricks already visible in the riotous Ultraism of the Day." Morse's pamphlet is now so scarce that it may not be amiss to give part of this section as an example of the anti-Catholic literature then flooding the Protestant American press:

> I have shown that a Society, (*the "St. Leopold Foundation"*) is organized in a Foreign Absolute government, having its central direction in the capital of that government at Vienna, under the patronage of the Emperor of Austria, and the other Despotic Rulers,—a Society for the purpose of spreading popery in this country. Of this fact there is no doubt. This "*St. Leopold Foundation*" has its ramifications through the whole of the Austrian empire. It is not a small private association, but *a great and extensive combination.* It embraces in its extent, as shown by their own documents, not merely the wide Austrian Empire, Hungary, and Italy, but it includes Piedmont, Savoy, and Catholic France; it embodies the civil and ecclesiastical authorities of all these countries. And is such an extensive combination in foreign countries for the avowed purpose of operating in this country, (no matter for what purpose,) so trivial an affair, that we may safely dismiss it with a sneer? Have these foreign Rulers so much sympathy with our system of government, that we may trust them safely to meddle with it, in *any way.* Are they so impotent in combination as to excite in us no alarm? May they send money, and agents, and a system of government wholly at variance with our own, and spread it through all our borders with impunity from our search, because it is nicknamed *Religion?* There was a time when American sensibilities were quick on the subject of *foreign interference.* What has recently deadened them?
>
> Let us examine the operations of this Austrian Society, for it is hard at work all around us; yes, here in this country, from one end to the other, at our very doors in this city. From a machinery of such character and power, we shall doubtless be able to see already some effect. With its head-quarters at Vienna, under the immediate direction and inspection of Metternich, the well-known *great managing general of the diplomacy* of Europe, it makes itself already felt through the republic. Its emissaries are here. And who are these emissaries? They are JESUITS. This society of men, after exerting their tyranny for upwards of 200 years, at length became so formidable to the world, threatening the entire subversion of all social order,

that even the Pope, whose *devoted subjects* they are, and must be, by the vow of their society, was compelled to dissolve them. They had not been suppressed, however, for 50 years, before the waning influence of popery and Despotism required their useful labours, to resist the spreading light of Democratic liberty, and the Pope, (Pius VII,) simultaneously with the formation of the Holy Alliance, revived the order of the Jesuits in all their power. From their vow of "*unqualified submission to the Sovereign Pontiff,*" they have been appropriately called the *Pope's body guard.* It should be known, that *Austrian influence elected the present Pope;* his body guard are therefore at the service of Austria, and these are the soldiers that the Leopold Society has sent to this country, and they are agents of this society, to execute its designs, whatever these designs may be. And do Americans need to be told what *Jesuits* are? If any are ignorant, let them inform themselves of their history without delay; no time is to be lost; their workings are before you in every day's events; they are a *secret* society, a sort of Masonic order, with superadded features of most revolting odiousness, and a thousand times more dangerous. They are not confined to one class in society; they are not merely priests, or priests of one religious creed, they are merchants, and lawyers, and editors, and men of any profession, and no profession, having no outward badge (in this country,) by which to be recognized; they are about in all your society. They can assume any character, that of angels of light, or ministers of darkness, to accomplish their one great end, the *service* upon which they are sent, whatever that service may be. They are all educated men, prepared, and sworn to *start at any moment, in any direction,* and for any service, commanded by the general of their order, bound to no family, community, or country, by the ordinary ties which bind men; and *sold for life* to the cause of the Roman Pontiff.

These are the men at this moment ordered to America, and can they do nothing, Americans, to derange the free workings of your democratic institutions? Can they not, and do they not fan the slightest embers of discontent into a flame, those thousand little differences which must perpetually occur in any society, into riot *and quell its excess among their own people as it suits their policy and the establishment of their own control?* Yes, they can be the aggressors, and contrive to be the aggrieved. They can do the mischief, and manage to be publicly lauded for their praise-worthy forbearance and their suffering patience. They can persecute, and turn away the popular indignation, ever roused by the cry of persecution

from themselves, and make it fall upon their victim. They can *control the press* in a thousand secret ways. They can write under the signature of "Whig", to-day, and if it suits their turn, "Tory", tomorrow. They can be Democrat to-day, and Aristocrat to-morrow. They can out-American Americans in admiration of American institutions to-day, and "condemn them as unfit for any people" to-morrow. These are the men that Austria has sent here, that she supplies with money, with whom she keeps up an active correspondence, and whose officers (the Bishops) are passing back and forth between Europe and America, doubtless to impart that information *orally* which would not be so safe committed to writing.

Is there no danger to the Democracy of the country from such formidable foes arrayed against it? Is Metternich its friend? Is the *Pope* its friend? Are his official documents now daily put forth, *Democratic* in their character?

O there is no danger to the Democracy; for those most devoted to the Pope, the Roman Catholics, especially the Irish Catholics, are all on the side of Democracy. Yes; to be sure they are on the side of Democracy. They are just where I should look for them, Judas Iscariot joined with the true disciples. Jesuits are not fools. They would not startle our slumbering fears, by bolting out their monarchical designs directly in our teeth, and by joining the opposing ranks, *except so far as to cover their designs.* This is a Democratic country, and the Democratic party is and ever must be the strongest party, unless ruined by traitors and Jesuits in the camp. Yes; it is in the ranks of Democracy I should expect to find them, and for no good purpose be assured. Every measure of Democratic policy in the least exciting will be pushed to *ultraism*, so soon as it is introduced for discussion. Let every real Democrat guard against this common Jesuitical artifice of tyrants, an artifice which there is much evidence to believe is practising against them at this moment, an artifice *which if not heeded will surely be the ruin of Democracy:* it is founded on the well-known principle that "*extremes meet*". The writer has seen it pass under his own eyes in Europe, in more than one instance. When in despotic governments popular discontent arising from the intolerable oppressions of the tyrants of the people, has manifested itself by popular outbreakings, to such a degree as to endanger the throne, and the people seem prepared to shove their masters from their horses, and are likely to mount, and seize the reins themselves; then, the popular movement, unmanageable any longer by resistance, is pushed to the extreme. The passions of the ignorant and vicious are

excited to courage by pretended friends of the people. Anarchy ensues; and then the mass of the people, who are always lovers of order and quiet, unite at once in support of the strong arm of force for protection; and despotism, perhaps, in another, but *preconcerted*, shape, resumes its iron reign. Italy and Germany are furnishing examples every day. If an illustration is wanted on a larger scale, look at France in her late Republican revolution, and in her present relapse into despotism.

He who would prevent you from mounting his horse, has two ways of thwarting your designs. If he finds your efforts to rise too strong for his resistance, he has but to add a little more impulse to them, and he shoves you over on the other side. In either case you are on the ground.

Short as had been the history of the Leopoldine Association, it had already, Morse warns his readers, accomplished marvels in the diffusion of the Catholic Faith:

We find it spreading itself into every nook and corner of the land; churches, chapel, colledges, nunneries and convents, are springing up as if by magic every where; an activity hitherto unknown among the Roman Catholics pervades all their ranks, and yet whence the means for all these efforts? Except here and there funds or favours collected from an inconsistent *Protestant*, (so-called probably because born in a Protestant country, who is flattered or wheedled by some Jesuit artifice to give his aid to their cause,) the greatest part of the pecuniary means for all these works are from abroad. They are the contributions of his Majesty the Emperor of Austria, of Prince Metternich, of the late Charles X, and the other Despots combined in the Leopold Society. And who are the members of the Roman Catholic Communion? What proportion are natives of this land, nurtured under our own institutions, and well versed in the nature of American liberty? Is it not notorious that the greater part are *Foreigners* from the various Catholic countries of Europe? Emigration has of later years been specially promoted among this class of Foreigners, and they have been in the proportion of three to one of all other emigrants arriving on our shores; they are from Ireland, Germany, Poland, and Belgium. From about the period of the formation of the Leopold Society, Catholic emigration increased in an amazing degree. Colonies of Emigrants, selected, perhaps, with a view to occupy particular places, (for, be it remembered, every portion of this country is as perfectly known at Vienna and Rome as in any part of our own coun-

try,) have been constantly arriving. The principal emigrants are from Ireland and Germany. We have lately been told by the captain of a lately arrived *Austrian vessel,* which, by the by, brought 70 emigrants from *Antwerp,* that a desire is suddenly manifested among the poorer class of the Belgian population, to emigrate to America. They are mostly, if not all, Roman Catholics, be it remarked, for Belgium is a Catholic country, and *Austrian vessels are bringing them* here. Whatever *the cause* of all this movement abroad to send to this country their poorer classes, the fact is certain, the class of emigrants is known, and the instrument, Austria, is seen in it —the same power that directs the Leopold Foundation.

The great mass of the immigrants arriving in such large numbers held the same creed, the Catholic. They were sunk in notorious ignorance, Morse writes, their minds were dead, and they had become but senseless machines in the hands of a despotic priesthood:

> They obey their priests as demigods, from the habit of their whole lives; they have been taught from infancy that their priests are infallible in the greatest matters, and can they, by new importation to this country, be suddenly imbued with the knowledge that in civil matters their priests may err, and that they are not in these also their infallible guides? Who will teach them this? Will their priests? Let common sense answer this question. Must not the priests, as a matter almost of *certainty,* control the opinions of their ignorant flock in civil as well as religious matters, and do they not do it?"

The "foreign" Irish Catholic element had increased to such proportion in the country that they were even organizing themselves into Irish Catholic groups for election purposes. Some of them indeed had had the audacity to form themselves into military companies. And these were the people who were shouting so loudly in admiration for their leader, the great legislator, who had recently thrown a firebrand into the South by denouncing slavery, Daniel O'Connell:

> That they are men who having *professed* to become Americans, by accepting our terms of naturalization, do yet, in direct contradiction to their professions clan together as a separate interest, and retain their foreign appellation; that it is with such a separate foreign interest, organizing in the midst of us, that Jesuits in the pay of foreign powers are tampering; that it is this foreign corps of religionists that Americans of both

parties have been for years in the habit of basely and traitorously encouraging to erect into an umpire of our political divisions, thus virtually surrendering the government into the hands of Despotic powers. In view of these facts, which every day's experience proves to be facts, is it not time, high time, that a true American spirit were roused to resist this alarming inroad of foreign influence upon our institutions, to avert dangers to which we have hitherto shut our eyes, and which if not remedied, and that immediately, will inevitably change the whole character of our government. I repeat what I first said, this is no party question, it concerns native Americans of all parties.

In a recapitulation of the facts he had given, Morse says:

I have set forth in a very brief and imperfect manner the evil, the great and increasing evil, that threatens our free institutions from foreign *interference.* Have I not shown that there is real cause for alarm? Let me recapitulate the facts in the case, and see if any one of them can be denied; and if not, I submit it to the calm decision of every American, whether he can still sleep in fancied security, while incendiaries are at work; and whether he is ready quietly to surrender his liberty, civil and religious, into the hands of foreign powers.

1. It is a fact, that in this age the subject of civil and religious liberty agitates in the most intense manner the various European governments.
2. It is a fact, that the influence of American free institutions in subverting European despotic institutions is greater now than it has ever been, from the fact of the greater maturity, and long-tried character, of the American form of government.
3. It is a fact, that Popery is opposed in its very nature to Democratic Republicanism; and it is, therefore, as a political system, as well as religious, opposed to civil and religious liberty, and consequently to our form of government.
4. It is a fact, that this truth, respecting the intrinsic character of Popery, had lately been clearly and demonstratively proved in public lectures, by one of the Austrian Cabinet, a devoted Roman Catholic, and with the evident design (as subsequent events show) of exciting the Austrian government to a great enterprise in support of absolute power.
5. It is a fact, that this member of the Austrian Cabinet, in his lectures, designated and proscribed this country by name, as the "*great nursery of destructive principles; as the Revolutionary school for France and the rest of Europe*", whose

contagious example of Democratic liberty had given, and would still give, trouble to the rest of the world, unless the evil were abated.

6. It is a fact, that very shortly after the delivery of these lectures, a Society was organized in the Austrian capital, called the St. Leopold Foundation, for the purpose "of promoting the greater activity of Catholic Missions in America."

7. It is a fact, that this Society, is under the patronage of the Emperor of Austria,—has its central direction at Vienna, is under the supervision of Prince Metternich,—that it is an extensive combination, embodying the civil, as well as ecclesiastical *officers*, not only of the *whole Austrian Empire*, but of the neighbouring Despotic States,—that it is actively at work, collecting moneys, and sending agents to this country, to carry into effect its designs.

8. It is a fact, that the agents of these foreign despots, are for the most part, *Jesuits*.

9. It is a fact, that the effects of this society are already apparent in the otherwise unaccountable increase of Roman Catholic cathedrals, churches, colleges, convents, nunneries, &c., in every part of the country; in the sudden increase of Catholic emigrations; in the increased clannishness of the Roman Catholics, and the boldness with which their leaders are experimenting on the character of the American people.

10. It is a fact, that an unaccountable disposition to riotous conduct has manifested itself within a few years, when exciting topics are publicly discussed, wholly at variance with the former peaceful, deliberative character of our people.

11. It is a fact, that a species of police unknown to our laws, has repeatedly been put in requisition to keep the peace among a certain class of foreigners, who are Roman Catholics, viz., Priest-police.

12. It is a fact, that Roman Catholic Priests have interfered to influence our elections.

13. It is a fact, that politicians on both sides have propitiated these priests, to obtain the votes of their people.

14. It is a fact, that numerous Societies of Roman Catholics, particularly among the Irish foreigners, are organized in various parts of the country, under various names, and ostensibly for certain benevolent objects; that these societies are united together by correspondence, all of which may be innocent and praiseworthy, but viewed in connection with the recent aspect of affairs are at least suspicious.

15. It is a fact, that an attempt has been made to organize a military corps of Irishmen in New-York, to be called the

O'Connell Guards; thus commencing a military organization of foreigners.

16. It is a fact, that the greater part of the foreigners in our population is composed of Roman Catholics.

Facts like these I have enumerated might be multiplied, but these are the most important, and quite sufficient to make every American settle the question with himself, whether there is, or is not, danger to the country from the present state of our Naturalization Laws. I have stated what I believe to be facts. If they are *not* facts, they will easily be disproved, and I most sincerely hope they will be disproved. If they are facts, and my inferences from them are wrong, I can be shown where I have erred, and an inference more rational, and more probable, involving less, or perhaps no, danger to the country, can be deduced from them, which deductions, when I see it, I will most cheerfully accept, as a full explanation of these most suspicious doings of Foreign Powers.

I have spoken in these numbers freely of a particular religious sect, the Roman Catholics, because from the nature of the case it was unavoidable; because the foreign political conspiracy is identified with that creed. With the *religious tenets* properly so called, of the Roman Catholic, I have not meddled. If foreign powers, hostile to the principles of this government, have combined to spread any religious creed, no matter of what denomination, that creed does by that very act become a subject of political interest to all citizens, and must and will be thoroughly scrutinized. We are compelled to examine it. We have no choice about it. If instead of combining to spread with the greatest activity the Catholic Religion throughout our country, the Monarchs of Europe had united to spread Presbyterianism, or Methodism, I presume, there are few who would not see at once the propriety and the necessity of looking most narrowly at the political bearings or peculiar principles of these Sects, or of any other Protestant Sects; and members of any Protestant Sects too, would be the last to complain of the examination. I know not why the Roman Catholics in this land of scrutiny are to plead exclusive exemption from the same trial.

The dangers inherent in this insidious foreign interference, "clearly in active operation under cover of the professedly *religious* surety of combined despots, called the St. Leopold Foundation," were therefore imminent; and these dangers were enhanced by the great increase within the country of "the most degraded class of foreign emigrants," who, by their natural unfitness for citizenship

and more particularly from their want of mental independence, were now crowding out of political and commercial life the real Americans of the nation. There must be a change, else the Republic was doomed. Too many seemed to consider that being born in America was not only no privilege but an actual detriment, compared with being born in Ireland, for example, a sort of unfortunate accident to be ashamed of, rather than boasted of.

This, then, says Morse in conclusion, is the momentous evil in the land of the free, this is the "Foreign Conspiracy," against which every true born American must rise if the Republic is to be preserved:

> The arbitrary governments of Europe,—those governments who keep the people in the most abject obedience at the point of the bayonet, with Austria at their head, have combined to attack us in every vulnerable point that the nation exposes to their assault. They are impelled by self-preservation to attempt our destruction,—they must destroy democracy. It is with them a case of life and death,—they must succeed or perish. If they do not overthrow American liberty, American liberty will overthrow their despotism. They know this fact well. They have declared it. They are acting in accordance with their convictions, and declarations, and they are acting wisely. They have already sent their chains, and oh! to our shame be it spoken, are fastening them upon a *sleeping* victim. Americans, you are marked for their prey, not by foreign bayonets, but by *weapons surer of effecting the conquest of Liberty* than all the munitions of Physical combat in the military or naval storehouses of Europe. Will you not awake to the apprehension of the reality and extent of your *danger?* Will you be longer deceived by the pensioned Jesuits, who having surrounded your press, are now using it all over the country to stifle the cries of danger, and lull your fears by attributing your alarm to a false cause. Up! up! I beseech you. Awake! To your posts! Let the tocsin sound from Maine to Louisiana. Fly to protect the vulnerable places of your Constitution and Laws. Place your guards; you will need them, and quickly too,—and first shut your gates. Shut the open gates. The very step of safety is here. It is the beginning of defense. Your enemies, in the guise of friends, by thousands, are at this moment rushing in to your ruin through the open portals of *naturalization.* Stop them, or you are lost, irrevocably lost. The first battle is here at the gates. Concentrate here. And be sure your enemy will here show his

strength; you here can test his force or existence, if you indeed doubt his existence. He will dispute this entrance inch by inch. Already is he alarmed, already has he set in motion his troops to resist. Will you despise the cry of danger? Well, be it so. Believe the foreign Jesuit rather than your own countrymen. Open wide your doors. Yes, throw down your walls. Invite, nay allure, your enemies. Enlarge your alms-houses and your prisons; be not sparing of your money; complain not of the outrages in your streets, nor the burden of your taxes. You will be repaid in praises of your toleration and liberality. What though European despots have compelled you to be the nurses of their halt, and blind, and naked, and the keepers of their criminals; what though they have compelled you to the necessity of employing your lives in toiling and providing for their outcast poor, and have caused you to be vexed, and your habits outraged by the expatriated turbulence of their cities, instead of allowing you to rejoice in the prosperity, and happiness, and peaceful neighbourhood of your own well-provided, well-instructed children.

Have you no reward? Oh, yes; your country is filling with a noble foreign population, all friends of liberty, all undoubted Democrats, taught in the School of Democratic Europe, accustomed to huzza with one voice for liberty, and under the guidance of Jesuit leaders well trained, far famed, long tried friends of Democracy; and to make assurance doubly sure, selected with the greatest care by Austria's Democratic Emperor, and Rome's Democratic Pope, who watch them with jealous eyes, and if not faithful in *upholding Democracy*, will deprive them of their stipulated wages, and recall them home, to receive their merited punishment—an Archbishop's see, or a Cardinal's hat. Democracy is safe with such keepers. The country is in no danger. Sleep on.

Morse ends his appeal for a change in the naturalization laws by the suggestion that if there be any Americans who doubt the existence of the Foreign Conspiracy, let them test it by attempting to make that change: "Stand firmly to this single point, and you will soon discover where the enemy is, and the tactics he employs. . . . You will find your enemy, though squat like a toad fast by the ear of our conscience, suddenly roused to show his infernal origin."

The three Societies of Lyons, Munich and Vienna actually *existed*. Upon that point Morse is particularly emphatic, because he believed that once the fact of their *existence* were acknowledged,

Americans in general would ask: What is their purpose? The answer would be:

> Their purpose was the spread of Popery. And what is the character of Popery? "You must not ask that question," says one. "You have no right to ask it. It is persecuting the Catholics to make so rude an inquiry." "Every man has a right to his religion," says another. "No union of church and state", cries a third. "The Catholics are as good as the Presbyterians any day", says a fourth. "It is the oldest religion, and therefore is the best", says a fifth. "It is *persecution,* and *intolerance,* and *illiberality,* and *bigotry*", cries a sixth. "For the Roman Catholic religion is changed; it is not that bloody, persecuting religion that it was in by-gone times, when John Huss and others were burnt as heretics. Roman Catholics have grown tolerant and liberal, they are now favourable to liberty; they advocate all the rights of man, such as, right of private judgment; the liberty of the press. They have imbibed the the spirit of the age." These, and such as these, are the popular and set answers when the question is asked: What is the character of Popery? The last is the only answer worth a moment's attention. For it seems to have more of the *anodyne* in it than any of the others. If the Roman Catholic religion is essentially changed in its objectionable features; if it has got rid of the arbitrary principles, and become democratic; if it is become tolerant and liberal; if it now inculcates truth and integrity, instead of falsehood, and fraud, I admit that much of its objectionable character, at least politically, is removed. Yet, who says it is changed? Will any Roman Catholic Bishop say it has changed any of its principles one iota? No, they have never said it officially, and never will. But even if it were true, the fact that European despots are forcing it upon us, would, in spite of all, throw a suspicious complexion over it. But now, suppose that this Roman Catholic religion, instead of being changed in its objectionable features, *still* avowedly *rigidly adheres to its most obnoxious and arbitrary principles;* that, instead of being democratic in character, it is the perfect opposite of democracy; that, instead of being tolerant and liberal, and conciliating, it is *intolerant,* and *illiberal,* and *denunciatory;* that, instead of being *in favour* of the liberty of the press, and *allowing* the right of private judgment, it *denounces* these rights; that, instead of inculcating truth and strict integrity, *it teaches the practice of falsehood* and *fraud.* Ah! you will say, that is a different affair. If such a character could be fixed upon the Roman Catholic system, and this system is that which is now patron-

ized by the monarchs of Europe to be propagated by Jesuits through this country, it becomes truly a serious matter, and we must inquire into it.—And is there any Roman Catholic ecclesiastic who, *authorized by his superior,* will dare to deny, under his own proper name:—

1st. That the Roman Catholic priesthood are taught at this day, (A. D. 1835) to account *Protestants* worse than Pagans.

2nd. That they are taught to consider all who are *baptized, even by those they term heretics,* as lawfully under the *power of the Church of Rome,* over whom the *Pope has rightful domination.*

3d. That they are taught, that they cannot tolerate the *rites of any* who are not in the church of Rome, and that whenever it is for the good of the church, *they must exterminate them.*

4th. That they are taught, that they may compel, by *corporal punishments,* all who are baptized; and consequently nearly all, if not all of every Protestant religious denomination to *submit to the Roman Church.*

5th. That they are taught that these punishments may be, CONFISCATION OF PROPERTY, EXILE, IMPRISONMENT, AND DEATH!

6th. That they are taught, that *expediency alone* may restrain them from exercise of any of these rights of compulsion against heretics; and that consequently, whenever they have the *power,* and it shall be thought *expedient,* it is their *duty* to exercise them.

Are these startling propositions? Consider them well, Americans. If any Roman Catholic ecclesiastic, any Bishop, or any one authorized by a Bishop, will maintain under his own proper name the *negative* of these six propositions, the writer pledges himself to maintain the *affirmative* under his own proper name. These are the doctrines *now* of the church of Rome.

Publications such as Morse's *Imminent Dangers* did not go unchallenged. The Catholic weeklies of Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Cincinnati, Bardstown, St. Louis, Washington, D. C., and Charleston were being edited by some of the best trained priests in the American Church, and with their courageous responses to the charges being made by the religious and political press, the controversy raised by Morse, swept the country. Dr. England replied directly to Morse in his address before the Eighth Georgia Convention, held at Augusta, May 10, 1836:

It is impossible for any person, living at present in these republics, to close his eyes or his ears against the evidence which every where exists of the spirit of misrepresentation which is so actively employed against our religion. However painful may be the avowal; it is impossible to deny that a bitter spirit of persecution has widely diffused itself; that this spirit is restrained only by the genius of our civil constitutions and the sense of justice which dwells in the breasts of multitudes of our fellow citizens, who though differing widely from us in religious doctrine, yet feel that we have an equal right to that religious freedom of which we should soon be despoiled, if they who villify us had the power which they are said to seek, and to attain which it is asserted they have already taken some measures.

Amongst other calumnies with which we are assailed, is one that our religion is inimical to our civil institutions. This is neither the time nor the place to enter upon a refutation of this slander upon religion and republicanism. I call it a slander upon republicanism; for it implies that the vast majority of the christian body in every nation and in every age, that is, the bulk of the civilized world during nearly eighteen centuries, have passed their verdict upon the incompatibility of republicanism with christianity.

To render Roman Catholics suspected in the eyes of their fellow citizens, it is next asserted, that they are the agents of the absolute governments of Europe, and employed by them to subvert our institutions, and to destroy our liberties. To prove this, reference is made to the vast sums of money transmitted by those governments to the Catholic prelates of this Union, and the vast number of foreign clergymen, subjects of those absolute monarchs who are daily poured upon our shores, to aid in this unholy purpose. It is a device of at least the standing of eighteen hundred years to charge against the devoted victim whom a religious tribunal could not successfully convict, that he is an enemy to Caesar.

If there be such a conspiracy, I am one of the conspirators. If I be unfaithful to the republic, I am a perjurer; for I have deliberately and formally pledged my solemn oath to bear true allegiance to the United States of America. If I have entertained a thought against that allegiance, I am inexcusably ungrateful; for since I placed myself under her protection, the republic has sustained and cherished and upheld me, both at home and abroad—Should I hesitate to prefer such a government, I should deserve compassion for my imbecility and suffering for my folly; because I have experienced elsewhere the evils, I have witnessed the crimes and I have wept over the ruin

> that inevitably followed from civil or political distinctions and preferences and partialities because of differences of religion, in countries where there existed the misfortune of religious separation. Mark then the extent of our conspiracy![21]

One of the results of Dr. England's visits to Vienna and Lyons was the foundation in his own diocese of an institution similar to these foreign charitable societies. Towards the end of the year 1834, he sent out a call for the Catholics of Charleston to meet him in the Cathedral for this purpose, and on January 21, 1835, the "Roman Catholic Missionary Society of the Diocese of Charleston" was inaugurated. The Society began with sixty members and soon spread to all the large centers of the Carolinas and Georgia. The *dizaine* system used by the Lyons Society was adopted, and the amount given by each member of the *dizaine* was five cents a week. The grouping of the *dizaines* into centuries, as in the Lyons-Paris method, was also kept. At the foundation meeting Dr. England read extracts from several Protestant journals to emphasize to his people the grave necessity of their unity in charitable support of the Church as well as in faith. One of the excerpts dealt with Protestant charity to Catholic institutions. On more than one occasion distinguished American Protestant citizens had publicly come to the aid of struggling Catholic priests and bishops in order to show their disapproval of the attacks which were fast driving the two Christian bodies into warring camps. One excerpt is typical of the appeal made to the readers of non-Catholic newspapers: "The fastidiousness of the Christian community respecting sectarian charity must be done away in regard to this [the Catholic] Church. It is an evil for which Christianity should have no charity, patriotism no toleration, and science and literature no friendship."

The Charleston Missionary Society afforded Dr. England a practical though irregular income for missionary purposes from this

[21] *Cath. Misc.*, vol. XIV, p. 369. The writer has a photostatic copy of the *Imminent Dangers* made from an original in the New York Public Library. Non-Catholics were not alone in attacking the Leopoldine Association. In several quarters the feeling had gained ground that the Vienna Society meant only to help Catholics from Austria and Germany. Dr. England wrote on September 17, 1836, to the American Consul at Vienna, Mr. J. J. Schwartz, explaining the cause of the objection which had been gathering force in American Catholic circles. Schwartz's answer (Irish College *Portfolio*, October 28, 1836, p. 130) reveals how seriously the Imperial Court was considering ways and means to satisfy all the dioceses in America so as to avoid jealousy.

time until his death. The anniversary of the Society was held on the fourth Sunday of each succeeding January, and at these assemblies Dr. England went over with the Committee the detailed report of the receipts and expenditures, as was done by the Central Committees of Lyons, Munich, and Vienna. In his address before the First Diocesan Convention (November, 1839), Dr. England declared that he would have been often so deeply involved in inextricable financial difficulties that all progress in the diocese would have been impeded "had it not been for the charitable aid so liberally bestowed upon us by those admirable societies for the aid of foreign missions, that of the Propagation in France, and the Leopoldine Society in Austria."

The Diocese of Charleston probably received no assistance directly from the *Ludwigmissionsverein* of Munich, during Bishop England's episcopate, but the Leopoldine Association sent to the Diocese of Charleston in the twenty-two years of Dr. England's episcopate the sum of 71,000 florins (approximately $34,000) as follows:

October 1831	10,000	florins
June 1833	10,000	"
January 1834	10,000	"
February 1835	6,000	"
January 1836	6,000	"
January 1837	4,000	"
January 1838	4,000	"
February 1839	8,000	"
February 1840	4,000	"
February 1841	4,000	"
February 1842	5,000	"
	71,000	"

The amounts given to the Church of the United States by the Society for the Propagation of the Faith of Lyons during the first twenty years of its existence were as follows:

1822	$2,757.00
1823	5,200.00
1824	6,940.00
1825	10,340.00
1826	8,740.00
1827	20,700.00
1828	22,200.00
1829	24,268.00

1830	23,394.00
1831	25,294.00
1832	22,960.00
1833	19,604.00
1834	20,564.00
1835	29,053.00
1836	44,133.60
1837	37,916.20
1838	53,501.60
1839	68,025.00
1840	125,572.80
1841	122,261.00
1842	127,360.40

Here again, owing to the condition of the Society's archives, it is impossible to tell with accuracy what proportion of these sums went to the Diocese of Charleston. But so far as the *Annales* record the amounts given, it would appear that the Diocese of Charleston received during Dr. England's episcopate nearly 220,000 francs:

1822	Nothing
1823	"
1824	"
1825	"
1826	"
1827	"
1828	5,000 francs
1829	5,740 "
1830	Nothing
1831	11,170 francs
1832	8,400 "
1833	10,140 "
1834	1,870 "
1835	9,800 "
1836	6,740 "
1837	6,000 "
1838	20,825 "
1839	13,827 "
1840	56,500 "
1841	40,000 "
1842	23,940 "
	219,952 "

Two visitors came to the United States in the interests of the Lyons and Vienna Societies. One of these Dr. England had the

pleasure of entertaining in Charleston, the Rt. Rev. Count de Forbin-Janson, Bishop of Nancy and Toul, who was present at the Fourth Provincial Council of Baltimore, in 1840, and who spent almost two years here, studying religious conditions.[22] The second, Canon Joseph Salzbacher of St. Stephen's Cathedral, Vienna, arrived in New York the week of Bishop England's death (April 17, 1842). After assisting at Bishop Conwell's funeral in Philadelphia, Canon Salzbacher visited Boston, Georgetown, Washington, Richmond, and Charleston, going as far west as Louisville and as far north as Detroit. The Vienna prelate covered, in the hundred days of his visit, eleven dioceses and seventeen states. After returning to Vienna in the late summer of 1842, he published an account of his journey: *Meine Reise nach Nord-Amerika im Jahre 1842.* Few books of the period give more accurate information or afford a better insight into the progress of the Catholic Church of the United States than this interestingly written summary which coincides with the year of Dr. England's death.

[22]Cf. De Rivière, *Vie du Mgr. de Forbin-Janson.* Paris, 1892.

CHAPTER XXV

National Catholic Progress

(1829-1833)

When the First Provincial Council of the American Church closed its sessions on October 18, 1829, the American hierarchy as a body was conscious for the first time of the remarkable progress of the Catholic Faith in this country. The Council of 1829 was a vindication for John England. Tradition has given him in consequence the prestige of the title: Father of our Provincial Councils. Bishop England knew so well the influences which were busy in American ecclesiastical affairs that he was not sanguine over the direct results of this first meeting of the hierarchy in twenty years. Indirectly the effects of the Council of 1829 were all that he could wish. The bishops had met, had discussed problems that were general to church discipline, and had compared their own local difficulties to the mutual benefit of all. But with the legislation enacted Dr. England was not satisfied. In reality, the main good the Council had accomplished was to give order and uniformity to what had been a group of ecclesiastical jurisdictions. Much would depend upon the promptness with which the bishops would respond to the thirty-eighth decree of the Council; namely, that within three years, unless the Archbishop of Baltimore should decide otherwise, they would meet again for deliberation on national church affairs.

Bishop England suspected that the next Council would be deferred by Archbishop Whitfield on one or other pretext:—the long and unpleasant journeys to be made by the prelates of Boston, Cincinnati, St. Louis, Bardstown, and Mobile; the advisability of giving a longer period of experience to the decrees of 1829; or the absence of any pressing necessity of bringing the Baltimore suffragans together so soon. In this surmise he was correct, for it was only upon the express wish of the Holy See that Dr. Whitfield sent out the summons for the Second Provincial Council in the spring of 1833.

Bishop England was never to forget those days in October, 1833, when the Council met. His influence in American Church affairs

had grown considerably during the four years following the Council of 1829. His appointment as Apostolic Delegate to Haiti gave him international prominence, and the increasing number of Catholics, most of whom came from the land of his birth and who hailed him on every possible occasion as the greatest Church leader in the United States, together with the uncommon esteem in which he was held by non-Catholics in the country, these and other factors made him a formidable figure in the eyes of those who hesitated to see the Church here develop along lines truly American.

These four years (1829-1833) are years of marvelous Catholic growth in the United States; they are also years of a profound Protestant American distrust of Catholicism. During these years the anti-Catholic forces which had never relinquished their belief in the danger to American institutions lurking in the spread of Popery, were able by one method or another, sometimes religious, sometimes industrial, at other times political and social, to amalgamate this distrust; and the rest of the nineteenth century of American history was to witness the harvest of unhappiness sown at this time.

The Province of Baltimore in 1833 consisted of the Archbishopric of Baltimore and twelve Suffragan Sees well situated geographically in the twenty-five States and Territories then composing the Union.

Accurate religious statistics for the year 1829 are not available. A contemporary summary, however, gives approximate figures. The number of Catholics in the United States is stated as considerably more than 600,000.[1] The Methodists were more numerous than any other Protestant Church, and totalled about 421,000. The Baptists had about 4,000 churches with probably 150,000 members. The Presbyterians numbered nearly 147,000. The Congregationalists claimed 115,000 and the Unitarians had 150 congregations. The Episcopalians had 598 churches, and the Quakers are estimated as being about 150,000. There was no unity possible among many of these non-Catholic religious groups except upon one basis: anti-Catholicism. The first attempt at such a unity occurred after the Council of 1829, when a group of clergymen of New York, New Haven, Princeton, and elsewhere, established in February, 1830, the *Protestant*, for the purpose of awakening the non-Catholic mind to the dangerous spread of Popery or Romanism in the United

[1] *Cath. Misc.*, vol. IX, p. 293.

States. The principal tenet of that section of the non-Catholic religious element in the country which began the opposition at this time was "the incompatibility of the Roman Catholic religion with the republican principles of these States."

The frontier was beginning again to move westward in 1829. In the new era which that year ushered into American life, the westward expansion marched side by side with the social and industrial problems immigration had caused in the East. As Schlesinger so well says in his *Political and Social History of the United States:*

> The national borders in 1829 stood flush with the Atlantic and the Gulf on the South, and stretched far westward to the Rockies, with certain claims to a portion of the Pacific Seaboard in dispute with Great Britain. A Union composed of sixteen states clinging to the Atlantic coastal plain had blossomed into twenty-four mighty commonwealths, two of which (Louisiana and Missouri) lay west of the Mississippi.
>
> The country intervening between the Mississippi and the Appalachians was all carved into states, with the exception of the areas now known as Michigan, Wisconsin, and Florida, which, however, possessed territorial governments. Since 1800 the population of the United States had more than doubled, increasing from five and one third millions to thirteen millions; and while in 1800 only one twentieth of the people lived west of the mountains, in 1830 nearly one third of them were to be found in that region.
>
> The West in 1829 possessed a unity of outlook and interest and a political solidarity that were to be conspicuously absent twenty years later. Up and down the Mississippi Valley, from north to south along the line of settlement, the frontiersman struggled with the same tasks of subduing the wilderness, conquering the savage Indians, killing wild animals, and creating social conditions suitable for rearing a family. The difficulties of the pioneer of the Old Northwest in hewing a clearing out of the hard woods of that region were matched by the trials of the Mississippi frontiersman in coping with the pine forests of the South. The sharp cleavage between "North" and "South," which was already apparent in the seaboard states, was, for the most part, lacking in the Mississippi Valley. Indeed, at this period, the Mississippi Valley may be regarded as a section by itself with interests and needs just as homogeneous and important as those of the two sections east of the Appalachians...
>
> The three outstanding traits of the West of 1829 were the individualism of the people, their belief in the capacity of the

common man, and their strong nationalism. The abundance of land and natural resources made it possible for any energetic individual to gain a livelihood, and made him scorn the thought of government aid or interference in his ordinary economic pursuits. The absence of distinctions among men as property owners tended to make the people disregard wealth as a criterion of fitness and to look upon all men as essentially equal. Whenever occasion demanded and obvious advantages were to be gained, the frontiersmen resorted to mass action, and showed that instinctive capacity for practical co-operation and self-government that we like to think of as distinctively American

Their nationalism was, in part, the result of their diverse origins. Coming from many states and even from lands across the sea, they could find common ground only in their allegiance to the government of all the states—that government which had permitted them to acquire their lands upon easy terms and had granted them full rights of self-government through admission into the Union. Ordinarily they were little concerned about the details of political organization or about fine distinctions turning on questions of constitutional construction. Theirs was a democracy as yet without organization, one that depended upon personal leadership.[2]

In the movement westward to the Mississippi Valley, the Protestant religious organizations recognized a new and wide field for their activities. The Protestant newspapers of this period carried weekly the message that the land beyond the Alleghenies must be saved at all costs from Romanism. The charge made as early as 1829 was that the Pope intended to use his "mighty wealth... to subjugate the valley of the Mississippi to his dominion."[3]

We know now how intimately the growth of the Middle West at this period influenced the politico-social situation in the East. To a larger extent than is generally surmised, the efforts the Church was obliged to make to minister to the growing congregations of Catholics in the "Valley", had a similar influence on church organization along the Atlantic. Expansion in the Middle West and

[2]Pp. 2-5.

[3]*Cath. Misc.*, vol. IX, p. 269. Paxson (*History of the American Frontier*, pp. 115-117) gives some interesting side-lights upon the relationship between the Presbyterian form of Church organization and the border aptitude for self-government and federation. But the subject has scarcely been touched as yet. Spalding's *Sketches* and his *Life of Flaget* contain some startling scenes of the camp meetings during these years of intense Protestant religious enthusiasm.

in the Northwest was bound to follow strict canonical lines and to bring out into relief any disorders remaining in church organization after the legislation of 1829.

On June 6, 1830, Philadelphia received an efficient coadjutor in Bishop Francis P. Kenrick; that same year, on May 24, the long vacancy in New Orleans was ended with the consecration of Bishop Leo R. De Neckere, C.M. Bishop Fenwick of Cincinnati died on September 25, 1832, but within a year Dr. Purcell had been consecrated for that See.

During these four years (1829-1833) there is visible within the Church a gradual unifying of its spiritual forces for the further spread westward of the Faith. Outside the Church, especially in what was then the Western settlements, there is visible the growing fear that "much is to be done, to save our country, from the follies which the huge wealth of the Master of Abominations may spread among us."[4]

That there was a conscious grouping of forces on both sides for the politico-religious controversy and violence which was to follow these years, is evident from the growth of the Catholic press at this time. Between 1829 and 1833 the following newspapers and magazines were begun under Catholic auspices:

The Catholic Press, Hartford, Connecticut, 1829.
The Jesuit, Boston, 1829.
The Irishman and Charleston Weekly Register, 1829.
The Irish Shield and Monthly Milesian, New York, 1829.
The Expostulator or Young Catholic's Guide, Boston, 1830.
The Irishman, New York, 1831.
The Catholic Telegraph, Cincinnati, 1831.
The United States Catholic Intelligencer, Boston, 1831.
The Shepherd of the Valley, St. Louis, 1832.
The Catholic Herald, Philadelphia, 1833.
The New York Weekly Register and Catholic Diary, 1833.
The Catholic Journal, Washington, D. C., 1833.

One of the direct results of the Council of 1829 was the establishment of a Catholic monthly magazine with the title, *The Metropolitan,* the first number of which appeared in January, 1830.[5]

[4]Rochester (N. Y.) *Observer,* cited *ibid.,* p. 294.

[5]The *Metropolitan* lasted but a year (1830). The *Religious Cabinet,* its successor, was published one year (1842), and was followed by the *United States Catholic Magazine,* with Rev. Dr. Charles I. White as editor (1843-1848). The *Metropolitan* was revived in 1853, and lasted until 1859.

How the Catholic press was viewed at the time (1830) is best displayed in the following citation from the *Southern Telegraph,* published at Richmond, Virginia:

> We have often been asked, how many periodicals now exist on this continent, expressly devoted to the promotion of popery? —It is impossible to answer this question exactly—because some of them we do not receive. We were perfectly wearied with examining falsehood, blasphemy, filth, calumny and despotism, week after week—and it eventually became so repugnant to our feelings, to contend with ignorance, infidelity, baseness, and blasphemy, that we dismissed the whole clan, with a sincere desire no more to be polluted by the Babylonish contagion. But yet in this country, the increasing number and variety of the Romish publications constitute a topic of very serious and alarming interest. We do not presume to give an accurate catalogue; because there are doubtless other minor periodicals; besides an endless variety of tracts, handbills, children's books, &c. with which the unwary are beguiled to their destruction.
>
> The following list we have either seen or met with among our exchange packets:
>
> The *Metropolitan*—a monthly Magazine of 40 pp., 8vo., patronized by the Dragon, and the Beast; and superintended by the *Most Arch* Roman himself; and his Jesuitical Fraternity.
>
> The *Jesuit,* a weekly sheet, printed at Boston; a genuine Judas both towards God and man, also, a *Youth's Magazine.*
>
> The *Free Press*, published at Hartford, an open enemy to all that is good.
>
> The *Truth Teller,* issued in New York, in every respect, the contrary to its hypocritical name.
>
> There are also most mischievous and insolent Popish papers published in Pittsburg, Cincinnati, and we believe in Kentucky, but their appellatives are not remembered.
>
> The *United States Catholic Miscellany* is printed in Charleston under the patronage of the Pope's chief Dominican for this Republic. It is a very wicked periodical, being in some respects worse than the Boston *Jesuit;* for it contains the same deadly poison, but sweetens the baneful drug so as to render it palatable; while the *Jesuit's* potion is so bitter that it hinders the reception.
>
> The *Vindicator* is a contemptible and base sheet published in Montreal, Lower Canada.
>
> The *Catholic,* a new deceiver, has just appeared in Kingston, Upper Canada.

> Of some of these papers large numbers are sent to all parts of the continent, *gratis*, from the fund established for that ungodly purpose, many of these nuisances are weekly scattered abroad among the citizens.[6]

The *United States Catholic Miscellany* was regarded as the foremost exponent of Catholic doctrines in the country at this period. One needs but to make a cursory survey of its pages year after year to appreciate the fact that Dr. England and his associates in the editorial duties of the *Miscellany* were the target for practically the whole anti-Catholic press of the country. Whenever the charges made against the Church were recognized by Dr. England, it was only because he weighed the possible harm silence might bring to the religious peace of the country. The years 1831-1833 were particularly bitter ones, and, if Bishop England took up the gauntlet thrown down in apparent sincerity by antagonists to the Roman communion, it was not only with the purpose of answering the charges, but even more especially with the view of preventing on the part of Catholics, both ecclesiastic and lay, any tendency to apathy or lethargy. Not all his brethren in the episcopate agreed with his policy of refutation. There was then, as there has always been, a number who believed in a dignified silence. But Dr. England realized that social and political adjustments were taking place all about him, and that unless the Church were kept alive to the tremendous changes being wrought in American life at what is probably one of the most crucial periods of its existence, the Faith would not retain within the fold all who were its children, nor make the advance it should into the ranks where error and prejudice ruled. To this period belongs his series of letters addressed to the "Candid and Unprejudiced American People", under the title *The Republic in Danger.*[7]

The burning of St. Mary's Church, in New York City, in 1831, by a band of bigots, was the first of a series of incendiary outbreaks which showed the dangerous trend anti-Catholicism was taking. The attacks made upon Roger Brooke Taney, after his appointment by President Jackson as Attorney General, were particularly pointed. It was stated that the appointment was made because he might "be

---

[6]Cited by the *Cath. Misc.*, vol. X, p. 150.
[7]*Works* (Reynolds), vol. IV, pp. 18-68.

helpful to the President in procuring absolution from the Pope, in which perhaps Mrs. Eaton might be included." The *Protestant* had the following comment:

> Popery in Power.—It is understood, that the new *Attorney General is a bigoted Papist;* and that he was selected for that very important office, with special reference to that circumstance, that the votes of all the Papists might be secured.
>
> No public office in the Federal Government can so easily be brought to influence national affairs in reference to popery, as that of the Attorney Gen. He is the official expositor of the laws of the Executive; and it is obvious, with how much facility a new system of interpretation and practice can be silently introduced by the Chicanery of a Papist, who is under those obligations to a Foreign Tyrant, which supercede and *nullify* all other allegiances.
>
> We know nothing of the Attorney General, except that in Baltimore he is represented as a thorough going Papist, possibly a concealed lay member of the order of the Jesuits—but one position we maintain, and the infallible correctness of which we are at all times ready to demonstrate: that *every sincere Papist is disqualified,* de facto, *from holding any office under a Protestant government.*[8]

As the coryphaeus of the anti-Catholic movement, the *Protestant* did not receive a welcome everywhere in non-Catholic circles. In Baltimore, for example, no newspaper would publish its prospectus, and "its scurrility was so gross as to disgust many members of the church and advocates of the cause whose interests its establishment was intended to promote." The cultured members of the Protestant clergy disclaimed it as the organ of their Churches. The *Protestant* began in 1832 to propose the formation in each city of branches of the American Protestant Association "for the purpose of exposing the evils of Popery and defending the principles of the Reformation." The net result of Dr. England's continued exposure of the charges made by the *Protestant* and by the numerous papers which followed in its wake was a revival among Catholics and Protestants of interest in Catholic doctrine and historical subjects. In the *Miscellany* of December 15, 1832, we read:

> One of the most effectual means whereby catholicity can be heard is the circulation of Catholic Works; hence the duty of patronizing their publication is as imperative as the necessity

[8]Cited by the *Cath. Misc.*, vol. XI, p. 75.

that demands them is manifest. It is apparent to every Catholic that one of the great misfortunes under which "popery" labours is that debt of gratitude she owes to her revilers: which she never can cancel unless through the press. The power of the religious press is levelled with deadly aim against her. It teems daily and hourly with foul misrepresentations of her tenets: it labours to stamp the brand of ignominy on her professors. Every dunce, that would be laughed to scorn in any department of literature that could indicate the gentleman, is sufficiently learned to expose her absurdities. No matter how stupid—ignorant—bigoted—illiberal the essayist may be, let him but summon "popery" to run the gauntlet, his very stupidity recommends him. No matter how illiberal his stuff may be, its very illiberality will attract a purchaser—and the latter will find time to read, and credulity to believe it. In fact the abuse of "popery" is the passport to the literary market of many pamphlets, travels, poems and romances that would otherwise never be read, and when read only tend to vitiate the taste of the community doomed to the infliction of such curses as the whinings of sorry poets and the sketches of prejudiced tourists. It is needless to advert to our religious papers, the angry Philippics of meeting houses, &c. The sole end of the whole is no doubt to drag to light the assumed corruptions of the papal Church, its senseless idolatory, &c.

Whilst the unholy crusade is thus waged, what course should Catholics pursue? Array against it the moral force of Catholic truth. The spirit of the age is one of *enquiry*: let it be met. Let the best expositions of Catholic writers be generously patronized. Let the publishers of those works, where such slanders are triumphantly refuted, be supported in their exertions to give them extensive circulation. Let the calm, dignified tone of our Catholic chieftains be heard in our enlightened country, and through a pure press, and rely upon it, craven defamers will stand abashed. The mountain pile of calumny will quickly fall before the touch of the Milners, the Horniholds, the Fletchers, the Hays, the Englands, the Bossuets. Let copies of their works be found in every Catholic family. They should be studied by every member of it. The parents should put them into the hands of their children. Let the Catholic youth after the first elementary instruction in the rudiments of the faith, master their contents that he may be able to silence the "gainsayer". Let him discipline his mind by their study, that he may be able to wipe away the stain which the reviler of his creed would fasten thereon. Let him thus become a theologian; that without a blush he may be

able to give an account of the Faith that is in him. His intercourse in life will bring him into contact with many honest enquirers, he should be able to solve their doubts, charitably correct their erroneous impressions. This course of reading he owes to the Church of which he is a member—to the name of Catholic which he professes—to his own honour as a freeman. Let it be steadfastly pursued, by every youthful Catholic; and the rising generation will bound into manhood a well-disciplined host, not, 'tis true, to bear their flag to the polls and through the ballot box revolutionize our institutions as a religious band, but vindicate the Faith of the Gregories, and the Augustines, whose mysteries were then as now equally assaulted: but now as then equally triumphant.[9]

Catholic bookstores were opened at this period in many cities and gradually a Catholic literature was made known in inquiring circles.[10]

Cholera, as we have already seen, swept the Atlantic seaboard in the summer of 1832, and the devotion of the priests and Sisters to the victims of the dread disease merited the sincere gratitude of city officials. Paragraphs such as the following became frequent:

I saw yesterday, in going the rounds of the district hospitals, sights that imparted a glow to my heart, and made it swell with delight. I saw those angels of mercy, the sisters of charity, robed in the dress of their order, amidst the pestilence, bending over the sufferers, and ministering to them with a tenderness and efficiency that made them, in my eye, higher than the common order of the sex; and, whilst I gazed in transport at their untiring attentions, I could scarcely help exclaiming aloud—*surely these are angels!*[11]

On September 1, 1832, Mr. William Stewart, Mayor of Balti-

[9]Vol. XII, p. 190.

[10]Probably one of the surest ways of tracing the growth of a Catholic reading public in the nation is to compare year after year the advertisements of the Catholic publishers in New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Cincinnati, as they appear in the *Catholic Directory*, or, as it was then known, the *Metropolitan Catholic Almanac and Laity's Directory*. Finotti's *Bibliographia Catholica Americana* (Boston, 1872), while coming only to the year 1820, contains much information on the history of Catholic literature in America at this later period.

[11]Cited in *Cath. Misc.*, vol. XII, p. 78. In this same issue (p. 79), we read: "Died on the 3d of August at 7 o'clock, P. M., at Hospital No. 3, in Baltimore Sister Mary Frances, one of those Angels in human form, who are found, not in the abodes of luxury, but in all our hospitals, supplying the wants of, and ministering comfort and consolation, to the sick and dying, regardless of personal danger and rejecting all temporal compensation."

more, sent the following resolutions to Father John Hickey, Chaplain of the Sisters of Charity:

To the Sisters of Charity:

I have hereby the pleasure of transmitting to you a Resolution, passed unanimously by the City Council of Baltimore.

It is with no ordinary satisfaction that I am privileged in their behalf to offer to you the sincere thanks of the Corporate authorities of the city of Baltimore, for your disinterested manifestations of benevolence in undergoing the greatest privations, and voluntarily extending your invaluable services in comforting and relieving our indigent fellow citizens, under the present afflicting dispensations of Providence. We are sensible that the purest purpose actuates your hearts, that the noblest designs influence your conduct, and that the faint commendation of man is but as dust in the balance in contrast with the more exalted favour of Him who seeth not as man seeth. At the present peculiar crisis, however, when a pestilential epidemic is ravaging our country, when apprehension had seized the minds of many individuals, and when few could be found who would subject themselves to the sacrifice or incur the hazard of attending to our hospitals you came forward and tendered your services, showing a self-devotion and a religious charity that demand especial praise, and confer an obligation inestimable in importance.

Since, however, the resolution received the unanimous concurrence of the Council, a circumstance has intervened which occasions the most painful emotions. I allude to the death of Sister Mary Frances, who has fallen a martyr in the holy cause in which she was engaged, and is now resting from her labour and her works will follow her.

To behold life thus immolated in so sacred a cause produces rather a sensation of awe than of sorrow, a sentiment of resignation to the Almighty fiat, rather than a useless regret at the afflicting event.

Such, therefore, must be the feelings of all in the case of Sister Mary Frances, and we submit without a murmur.

Accept then the tender of our deepest sympathy for the loss you and our city have sustained by the departure of your Sister and receive the most unfeigned expression of our acknowledgments for the kindness you have rendered our fellow citizens, in your opportune succor at the present fearful period.

WM. STEWART,
Mayor.[12]

[12]*Cath Misc.*, vol. XII, p. 86. Cf. Scharf, *Chronicles of Baltimore*, p. 461. Balto., 1887.

The following year, on the eve of his retirement (November 3, 1832), Mayor Stewart wrote as follows to Father A. J. Elder, then Chaplain:

Dear Sir: The duties assigned me, as Mayor of the city of Baltimore, being concluded this day, I cannot retire to the quietude of private life without acknowledging the obligation which the board of health and myself are under to you, sir, for your persevering attention to our afflicted fellow citizens, and through you to those invaluable *Sisters of Charity*, whose benevolent conduct has been of such essential utility in alleviating the horrors incident to the fatal epidemic, which, a short period since, raged in our city. But their attention to the sick was not the only service rendered by the Sisters of Charity; they voluntarily furnished clothing, at their own expense, to the destitute orphans of those who fell victims to the *Cholera;* thus exhibiting the purest system of unostentatious charity that could have been devised.

At the hospitals, their labour and attention became so important, and their exertions so incessant that even they were often physically exhausted and required the helping hand of others. At this time the Sisters of Charity, at the orphan asylum, and the infirmary, freely tendered their sisterly assistance to smooth the path of anxiety and care, of those especially devoted to the hospitals.

But, it surely is a solemn consideration, that the Sisters of Charity, will retire with two less of their number, than when they commenced their labour of love, in Baltimore.

The rapacious and desolating scourge, with indiscriminating violence, seized Sisters Mary Frances and Mary George, and transferred their administering spirits to regions of peace and tranquillity. We humbly bow in submission to the divine dispensation, confiding in the evangelist who saith, "Blessed are the dead, who die in the lord."

The Board of Health and myself, have deemed it an imperious duty, in behalf of the citizens of Baltimore, to express our warmest gratitude, and deepest sense of obligation, for those services which were given without compensation; thereby leaving us doubly your debtors.

Be pleased, therefore my dear Sir, to tender the sincere and grateful thanks of the Board of Health and myself, to Sisters *Barbara, Clare, Leocadia, Julia, Euphrozyne,* at hospital No. 2 —to Sisters *Mary Paul, Dometilla, Mary Jane* and *Mary James* at hospital No. 3—Sisters *Ambrosia, superior* of the infirmary; and also to *Henrietta, Dorothea, Hillaria, Octavia,*

Delphine, and *Chrysostom* of that institution—to Sisters *Felicity*, *Superior* of the Orphans' Asylum; and also, to *Camilia*, *Bernadine*, *Marcellina*, *Brozillia* and *Alphonsa*, of that institution, for their unwearied attention to the sick of Cholera; and although they will receive no pecuniary remuneration from us, yet I humbly hope, their reward is registered in Heaven.[13]

In Philadelphia a similar tribute was given to these devoted women:

To the President and Members of the Select Council.

Sir and gentlemen: Accompanying this communication, you will receive a letter from the Sisters of Charity, declining the pieces of plate voted to them by the late council.

I at the same time take leave to suggest the necessity of an appropriation of two thousand dollars, to meet the bills already incurred by the different Sanatory Hospitals. With sentiments of high consideration, I have the honour to be your most obt. serv't.

JNO. SWIFT, *Mayor.*

November 8th, 1832.

To His Honour the Mayor of the City of Philadelphia.

Respected Sir,

The Sisters of Charity beg leave to submit respectfully to the city authorities that it would be at variance with the spirit of their institution and contrary to the *rules* by which they are governed as a religious community, for them to receive anything in consideration of their services, except mere personal expenses. They are induced to make your honour acquainted with the circumstance, in consequence of its being repeatedly stated to them that a piece of plate with an appropriate inscription, was voted to each of the Sisters who served as nurses in the public institutions during the prevalence of the cholera. They are aware that the offering was not to be presented as a recompense for their services, but as a mark of public approbation of their conduct. If their exertions have been useful to their suffering fellow beings and satisfactory to the public authorities, they deem it a sufficient reward, and indeed the only one which it would be consistent with their vocation to receive. For the motives which prompted the offering, they are sincerely grateful—and they trust that your honour and the members of the City Council will not be displeased (considering the motives which influenced them as a *religious commu-*

[13] *Ibid.*, p. 294.

nity) at their declining to accept any farther testimony of that kindness and respect, which, in their intercourse with the hospitable and elsewhere, they have not ceased to experience.

SISTERS OF CHARITY.

October 26, 1832.

Mr. Chandler offered the following preamble and resolution which were agreed to:

Whereas, The Sisters of Charity, have declined the acceptance of the plate with which it was resolved by the late council to present them, in testimony of the public sense of gratitude entertained for their devoted exertions during the prevalence of the cholera,—on the ground that such acceptance would be at variance with the spirit and rules of their institution as a religious community; And, whereas, we are disposed to respect their motives for thus declining, in consequence of which the money intended for the purchase of said plate, is now as if it had not been appropriated; therefore,

Be it resolved, by the Select and Common Council, That said money shall be given for the support of the Orphans and the education of poor Children in the three institutions, over which the Sisters of Charity preside, viz: The Asylum in Sixth Street near Spruce; the Asylum in Broad, between Chestnut and Market; and the Female Free School in Prune Street—in the following proportions one half of the whole sum to the Asylum in Broad Street, and the other moiety equally between the Asylum in Sixth near Spruce, and the Female Free School in Prune Street, aforesaid.[14]

All Kentucky was ringing with praise for the heroic nuns who lost their lives in caring for the cholera victims at this time.[15]

While the newspapers of New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Bardstown, and Charleston were printing these tributes to the Sisters for their heroic charity, the *Protestant* was continuing its vilification of the Church. As an example of its spirit the following is cited from its issue of February, 1832:

PROGRESS OF POPERY

Jersey, Elizabethtown.—On the 13th of September, 103 persons were confirmed in their idolatry; and the mass house is about to be very much enlarged.

Clearfield.—A new temple for the mass was opened on Oc-

---

[14]*Ibid.*, p. 167.

[15]Cf. Shea, *op. cit.*, vol. III, p. 603; Fox, *Life of Bishop David*, pp. 135-140. New York, 1926.

tober 4th and twenty-five persons entered themselves as vassals of Babylon the Great.

Grampian Hills.—A new house for the idolatrous ceremonies of Rome is about to be erected.

Huntington.—On the 7th of October, fifty-two persons received the mark of the beast.

Williamsburg.—A graveyard was blessed! and eighty one persons bowed their knee to the Roman beast, on October 9.

Newry.—A new mass house is almost finished, & fifteen persons were confirmed in their anti-christianism on October 10.

Ebbensburg.—On October 14, and the next day, 120 persons received the seal of the man of sin, and the graveyard was sprinkled with Roman salt water.

Hart's Sleeping Place.—On October 16th, the Oratory was blessed! and seventy were confirmed "in the workings of Satan."

Loretto.—On the 18th of October, two hundred and twenty-three persons entered the army of Romans, who are gathering together for the battle against the Almighty!

Cameron's Bottom.—On the 21st of October, thirty-six persons publicly avowed their idolatry, and the mass house and cemetery were sprinkled with Jesuit's brine, to frighten away the devil their master.

Pittsburg, Pa.—On November 7th, a female proselyte, and seven other persons, became practitioners in the mysterious iniquity of the convent.[16]

The death of Charles Carroll of Carrollton on November 14, 1832, was the subject of editorial comment all over the United States and few newspapers failed to notice his Catholic faith.

The erection of the new See of Detroit on March 8, 1833, took the State of Michigan and the Northwest Territory out of the jurisdiction of Cincinnati. Bishop Rese was consecrated in Cincinnati on October 3, 1833, and left at once for Baltimore to attend the Second Provincial Council. His object was to bring to the attention of the Fathers of the Council the necessity of an organized mission among the Indians.

The anti-Catholic movement gained such impetus during these years (1829-1833) that the Fathers of the Council of 1833 were

[16]Cited in the *Cath. Misc.*, vol. XII, p. 255. At the close of the year 1832, Dr. Constantine C. Pise was appointed Chaplain of the United States Senate.

obliged to take public notice in their *Pastoral* of its growing strength:

> We notice, with regret, a spirit exhibited by some of the conductors of the press, engaged in the interests of those brethren separated from our communion, which has, within a few years become more unkind and unjust in our regard. Not only do they assail us and our institutions in a style of vituperation and offence, misrepresent our tenets, villify our practices, repeat the hundred times refuted calumnies of days of angry and bitter contention in other lands, but they have even denounced you and us as enemies to the liberties of the republic, and have openly proclaimed the fancied necessity of not only obstructing our progress, but of using their best efforts to extirpate our religion: and for this purpose they have collected large sums of money. It is neither our principle nor our practice to render evil for evil, nor railing for railing; and we exhort you rather to the contrary, to render blessing, for unto this are you called, that you, by inheritance, may obtain a blessing. Recollect the assurance of the Saviour—"Blessed are you, when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely for my sake; rejoice and be exceeding glad: because your reward is very great in heaven: for so they persecuted the prophets that were before you." We are too well known to our fellow-citizens to render it now necessary that we should exhibit the utter want of any ground upon which such charges could rest. We, therefore, advise you to heed them not: but to continue, whilst you serve your God with fidelity, to discharge, honestly, faithfully, and with affectionate attachment, your duties to the government under which you live, so that we may, in common with our fellow-citizens, sustain that edifice of rational liberty in which we find such excellent protection.[17]

Although the legislation of the Council of 1829 was thorough and constructive, its application accentuated the grave problems still affecting the peace of the Church in the United States. The two *Pastorals* of 1829 had courageously pointed out the dangers to the Church both from enemies without and from disobedient clergy and laity within the fold. The greatest misfortune to which the Church was exposed was the misinterpretation of its tenets, its principles and its practices. The Fathers of the Councils of 1829 and of 1833 did not attempt to explain the origin and continuance of the evil,

[17]Cf. Guilday, *National Pastorals etc.*, p. 78.

but merely reminded the faithful of that melancholy fact. "Good men", the *Pastoral* of 1829 says, "—men otherwise well informed, deeply versed in science, in history, in politics; men who have improved their education by their travels abroad as well as they who have merely acquired the very rudiments of knowledge at home; the virtuous women who influence that society which they decorate, yielding to the benevolence of their hearts, desire to extend useful knowledge: and the public press; the very bench of public justice—have all been influenced by extraordinary efforts directed against us; that from the very highest place in our land to all our remotest borders, we are exhibited as what we are not, and charged with maintaining what we detest. Repetition has given to those statements a semblance of evidence; and groundless assertions remaining almost uncontradicted, wear the appearance of admitted and irrefragable truth."[18]

The apathy of Catholics towards their opponents, an apathy honestly admitted in 1829, was to give way before the Second Provincial Council was convoked in October, 1833, to a remarkable literary activity which marks the birth of American Catholic letters. But the evil from without was then, as always, a mixed evil. There were defections from the Church in consequence; and the revilers of the Catholic Faith even in those days were able to enlist the assistance of renegade priests in their designs. Violence was used during these years—the first of the long series of crimes committed in the name of those who openly expressed their hatred for Catholicism. But the very violence used was provocative of interest in Catholic doctrines and some remarkable conversions took place at this time.[19]

It was otherwise with the evil lurking in the Fold itself. The Council of 1829 pleaded with Catholics for unity. Schism had blackened the fair name of the Church from Carroll's day, and trusteeism, America's own contribution to the history of schism and heresy, was so deep-rooted in many congregations that even the stern decrees of 1829 did not wholly eradicate its principles and its practice. There were other problems disturbing the equanimity of

---

[18]*Ibid.*, pp. 27-28.

[19]Cf. Mannix, *The American Convert Movement*, Appendix B: *Dictionaries of Converts* (pp. 138-139). New York, 1923.

Catholic life, and not the least among these was the lack of harmony in some of the dioceses between the bishops and the people. There was, moreover, the action of forces still at work in the hierarchy itself apparently to preserve an ascendancy that was racial and was believed to be to some extent foreign in its viewpoint.

A summary of the internal situation of the American Church at the opening of the Second Provincial Council would of necessity reveal a certain number of facts proving the absence of a harmonious organization. In Boston, from 1829, when the anti-Catholic movement reached its climax of violence, Bishop Fenwick found himself in a whirlpool of animosity. This animosity must not be misunderstood. It was not wholly religious. There were natural causes at work; and were the respective situations of Americans and newcomers changed, the same results might have occurred. New England had been largely one in racial and religious outlook up to the beginning of the immigration period. "Nearly all the inhabitants spoke the same tongue, dressed, looked, and thought alike, and lived in a state of rude but substantial comfort. An ill-fed peasantry, of good lineage, but outwardly uncouth, speaking a language that sounded wild, and generally deprived of education, began to intrude itself. They were the first of their kind. They took the bread out of the mouths of the laboring class and lowered the rate of wages. They represented, moreover, a race which was the object of immemorial prejudice and of a character profoundly different from the English."[20]

Political causes also were at work to place the newcomers in opposition to the older stock. New England Federalism had reached a potential policy as early as 1814 and threatened the granting of the franchise to the "foreigners". The historian must admit, however, that of all the causes of social disunion religious fanaticism ranks among the strongest. In the transplanting of religious feuds, New England gave the example to the rest of the Union. Outbreaks occurred in Boston in 1829 when the houses of Irish Catholics were stoned, and it was not long before the anti-Catholic element found its leader in Rev. Lyman Beecher, D.D., of the Park Street Church. The destruction of the monument to Father Râle, which Bishop

[20] *The History of the Catholic Church in the New England States*, vol. I, p. 50. Boston, 1899.

Fenwick had erected at Norridgewock in 1833, was the prelude to the outrage which disgraced the fair name of Massachusetts in 1834.

But the Church in New England was making progress in spite of this growing opposition. In a letter to Bishop Fenwick of Cincinnati, dated Boston, April 6, 1831, Bishop Fenwick of Boston speaks of the constant attacks made upon him by the Calvinist papers of Boston and of the particular grievance they had against the seminary which he had founded. The far-seeing Bishop of Boston realized that a practical method of allaying the mistrust of Catholic doctrines was a native clergy. Numerous conversions had taken place in the midst of all this clamor, and in spite of the attacks the Church was becoming daily better known in Boston.[21]

New York's difficulties were of a more involved kind. Bishop Dubois took possession of that See in the autumn of 1826 under very unfavorable conditions. Father Taylor's tactless sermon at his consecration in Baltimore made public the vexations that awaited the former President of Mount St. Mary's College. Bishop Dubois was sixty-three years old at the time. One of his biographers admits that it is doubtful if the eighteen years he had spent as head of the College at Emmitsburg was the best preparation "for dealing with a clergy who had not been trained to submission, and with laymen who had an exaggerated conception of their rights and privileges. Obstinate by nature and by training, he had not acquired diplomatic self-command and the firmness which never irritates even in the day of victory. His very age, while it inspired respect, roused opposition by the positiveness which is often its accompaniment."[22] Bishop Dubois' first *Pastoral* spoke out courageously on the sources of the opposition to his appointment. His chief difficulty was the lack of harmony among his clergy. The priests in the diocese (New York State and the northern part of New Jersey) numbered eighteen, and the distances separating them from one another and from episcopal control tended to lessen the force of authority. To remedy this situation as well as to meet the needs of the increasing congrega-

---

[21]A copy of this letter was printed in the *Berichte* of the Vienna Society, vol. II, pp. 27-28. Bishop Fenwick relates that whole families were converted at the time of this violence.

[22]Herbermann in the *Hist. Rec. and Studies*, vol. I, p. 278. The New York situation is clearly described in Bishop England's letter to Archbishop Whitfield, July 22, 1830 (Catholic Archives of America, Notre Dame).

tions, Bishop Dubois began planning a Diocesan Seminary. This was "the object dearest to my heart", he wrote to the Society of the Propagation of the Faith in 1830. It was also to cause dissensions among his clergy and eventually to become one of the reasons for his own appeal for a coadjutor in 1836. The Nyack Seminary which was begun in 1832 was burned down in 1834 just as it was nearing completion. Frictions of other kinds arose, and all the old evils of trusteeism were again in full sway in the City of New York.

The Philadelphia situation grew from bad to worse after Bishop Conwell's incontinent return to his episcopal See in 1829. Cardinal Cappellari had invited the Philadelphia prelate to Rome in 1827; in 1828, the invitation to remain in Rome was repeated as the wish of Pope Leo XII. Father Matthews, Pastor of St. Patrick's Church, Washington, D. C., was appointed Apostolic Administrator of the diocese, with instructions to order Fathers Harold and Ryan, the Dominicans, to leave the city and to proceed to Cincinnati, where they would be among members of their own Order.

Fathers Harold and Ryan decided that to obey Propaganda and the Master-General of the Dominicans violated their rights as American citizens. After failing to secure an abrogation of the orders from Rome, they appealed to the United States Government in a series of letters that are unique in the history of the Church in this country. In a first letter to Henry Clay, the Secretary of State, dated July 2, 1828, Father Harold characterizes the letters from the Pope and the Vicar-General of the Dominican Order as an infraction of his rights as a citizen of the United States.

> For me, then, to set the example [he wrote], of obeying the mandate which I now submit to the inspection of the Executive, and, more especially, since it has been ostentatiously promulgated in the public journals, by the Catholic Bishop of Philadelphia, as an acknowledged functionary of the See of Rome, would be neither consistent with my principles as a Catholic, nor with the spirit and letter of my sworn allegiance to the Constitution of the United States; under which I have distinctly renounced and disclaimed the existence of any civil or political fidelity on my part to any foreign State whatever. I am also deeply impressed with the conviction that such an interference in the personal freedom of the citizens of these United States, as this injunction would establish, if obeyed or tolerated, must eventually place the whole order of the priesthood

> of our church at the complete and irresponsible disposal of the Court of Rome, and subject the Catholics, generally, of the United States, to the false charge of divided allegiance in civil and political matters, which serves at this day, as a pretext for the civil disabilities of millions of Roman Catholics in Europe. So complete is the subjection which this mandate claims, that it affects to be independent of reason, and forbids all inquiry on this head: *Ne causas inquiras deprecor.*[23]

Harold claimed the protection of the President against "this novel and unauthorized invasion" of his private rights. Father Ryan made application to become a citizen on August 18, 1828, and then wrote to the same effect to Clay. Accompanying their letters were copies of the documents from Rome with translations. In the absence of Mr. Clay, Daniel Brent, then Under-Secretary, wrote at the President's direction on July 9, 1828, to James Brown, Minister Plenipotentiary to France, explaining to our Minister that since the United States had no diplomatic representative at the Papal Court, it was the President's wish that the case of Fathers Harold and Ryan be brought to the attention of the Papal Nuncio in Paris. Harold and Ryan came to Washington to present their appeal in person, and Brent, being a Catholic, was placed in the delicate position of being their intermediary with the Court of Rome.

The next letter, dated Philadelphia, September 22, 1828, is from Harold and Ryan to Henry Clay, protesting against the circulation of copies of their appeal in New York, Philadelphia, and elsewhere. Mr. Brent replied on October 9, that the Department of State regretted any misuse of these copies, but that it felt warranted in having them made for the purpose of discussing the issue involved. On October 10 and 11, Father Matthews wrote to Henry Clay justifying the action of the Holy See and his own in transmitting the decision of Rome to Harold and Ryan. James Brown reported to the Secretary of State, by letter dated Paris, October 13, 1828, that he had called upon the Papal Nuncio and had laid the case of Fathers Harold and Ryan before him. Great care was taken by all the officials concerned not to allow the least word or phrase to be used which in any way might be interpreted as an infringement on the temporal rights of the two priests or on the spiritual rights of the Holy See. Mr. Brown's letter was sent by Henry Clay to Harold

[23] *Works* (Reynolds), vol. V, p. 215.

and Ryan on November 21, 1828, and the incident was closed so far as the United States Government was concerned. Clay recognized the right of the Holy See to give such an order, and when the letter sent by Harold and Ryan on November 26, 1828, did not change Clay's view of the case, the two clergymen decided to return to Ireland.

On September 16, 1829, Dr. England met Father Harold in Philadelphia, and for the first time saw the Brent-Brown correspondence. This he considered an unwarrantable interference on the part of the government. Harold in reply to the Bishop of Charleston pointed out that he had a precedent for his action in the appeal made by the Jesuit Superior to the State Department in 1824 against the decision of the Holy See in regard to the Society's property at Whitemarsh. On September 26, Dr. England wrote, as we have seen, to President Jackson asking for the privilege of copies of the correspondence of 1824 and 1828.[24]

Dr. Conwell explained to the Fathers of the Council of 1829 that he had no intention of exercising jurisdiction in the Diocese of Philadelphia and professed his attachment to the Holy See and his regret if his departure without Rome's permission should be considered disobedience. Archbishop Whitfield told him that he had suspended himself by his return, and advised him to abstain from saying Mass in the Archdiocese of Baltimore. Dr. Conwell had not committed any overt act which would justify his dismissal from the episcopal office; and to a certain extent he seems to have won the pity of the Archbishop and the other suffragans, who interceded with the Holy See to allow him to remain in Philadelphia. He was willing to accept a coadjutor to whom he promised to leave the administration of the diocese. All he asked was that the title "Bishop of Philadelphia" be left to him, and that he be permitted to spend the remainder of his life in that city. A letter to this effect was signed on October 11, 1829, by Bishops Flaget, England, Rosati, and the two Fenwicks. Archbishop Whitfield wrote on October 24, 1829, asking the Holy See to have mercy on Conwell, "ad misericordiam adducor erga calamitosum senem, qui jam fractus annis,

[24]The Harold-Ryan correspondence with the Department of State was published by Dr. England in the *Miscellany*, in 1830, pp. 213-232.

laboribus attritus, aerumnis prope confectus, ingenii levitate magis quam malitia peccavit."[25]

Dr. Whitfield did not believe that Father Matthews was suitable as Conwell's coadjutor. He was not popular with the clergy or the people, was an indifferent preacher, and had given little attention to Philadelphia. The Fathers of the Council decided to ask the Sacred Congregation to appoint Father Francis P. Kenrick whom Flaget had once called the *baculus firmissimus senectutis nostrae.* Kenrick was chosen on January 25, 1830, from a group of candidates proposed by the Council and by Dr. Conwell, Fathers McGuire, O.F.M., Michael Hurley, O.S.A., Gallitzin, Hughes, and Heyden.[26] Dr. Kenrick was consecrated at Bardstown on June 6, 1830, and Bishop England preached the sermon on this occasion.[27] On July 7, 1830, Bishop Kenrick reached Philadelphia. Kirlin says of him:

> He was young, intellectual, and energetic, well informed about the situation in Philadelphia, and determined to act decisively in the administration of the long-suffering diocese. His appointment was providential, for he was admirably equipped to bring order out of the chaos of affairs, and to form by his zeal and intelligence the nucleus of a Diocese into the great successful factor it became in the affairs of the Church in America. Although the newcomer had no pleasant prospect before him in taking up the tangled skein of the Church administration in Philadelphia, he was equal to the task.
>
> With the appointment of the co-adjutor, the administration of Bishop Conwell ended in everything but name. It was most delicate work in the twelve remaining years of the latter's life, for the young Bishop to govern the Church, but he displayed the utmost tact and consideration toward Bishop Conwell. Like any old gentleman of eighty who had been in a position of power all of his life, he refused to be set aside and clung jealously to his rights and privileges, asserting these and declaiming against what he thought the audacity of "the boy" (as he called him) who had come as his co-adjutor.
>
> It would be unkind to expose or to comment on the life and acts of the venerable prelate during these years, during nine of which he was totally blind, until his death at the age of ninety-four. His dependence was most galling to him, and his letters

[25]Prop. Arch., *Lettere,* vol. 311, fol. 197.
[26]*Ibid., Atti* (1830), p. 192.
[27]O'Shea, *The Two Kenricks.* Philadelphia, 1904.

requesting the subsidy voted him by the Trustees are most pathetic. His almost interminable letters to other Bishops advising them of affairs in their own dioceses, to his relatives regulating minute details of their families and affairs, to public men throughout the country congratulatory and advisory, are all instances of advanced age that clings feverishly to power, and cannot see or will not see that its usefulness is over.

Throughout it all Bishop Kenrick was most kind and considerate to Bishop Conwell, although by word and letters the elder protested stoutly to the contrary. Once when Bishop Kenrick was absent on a Visitation and Confirmation tour, Conwell had the younger Bishop's furniture taken from his room, and ensconced himself therein, and wrote to Bishop Kenrick to say what he had done. On Bishop Kenrick's return to the city he rented a house in South Fifth Street, next to the cemetery, which is now 257 South Fifth Street. He afterwards took a house on the west side of Fifth Street below Spruce, now Number 316.

Bishop Conwell remained at St. Joseph's with his servants and innumerable nephews and cousins, though his household arrangements did not always work smoothly with that of the Jesuits. Death at length came to him in 1842.[28]

Father Harold wrote from Dublin on February 3, 1830, in reply to a letter from one of his many Philadelphia friends:

> Of that unhappy man who was B. of P. and is deposed by his own folly and depravity, I can only say that if he has human sense and feelings, he would look to the grave as a good retreat from his present degradation. He has brought ruin upon himself by the barest falsehood, the blackest ingratitude, and the most crying injustice to his best friends; he has proved himself unworthy of his office and so regardless of its duties, so irreligious, so utterly insensible to the claims which the finest congregation in the world had upon him, that God must have pulled him down from a rank which it seemed to be the study of his life to degrade . . . . . he had left nothing undone to injure me . . . . .

And yet, these same archives (Tallaght) contain a letter from Dr. Conwell to Father Ryan dated February 20, 1830, which is given here in full:

---

[28] *Catholicity in Philadelphia,* p. 265. This insight into the Philadelphia situation is corroborated by Dr. England's letter to Bishop Fenwick of Cincinnati, Sept. 22, 1830 (Catholic Archives of America, Notre Dame).

My dear & Reverend Sir,

I think that both you and Mr. Harold will be well pleased to hear from me, and to assure you that nothing could be more satisfactory to me than to hear of your welfare, for which reason I consider it proper to avail myself of this opportunity to put you in possession of these my sentiments. And further to signify that I sincerely regret our separation. You know that I had been called on by his Holiness and the Sacred Congregation to the *limina Apostolorum, omni mora relicta,* and that notwithstanding the numerous difficulties that lay in the way I did not hesitate to comply, because I had made a promise to visit Rome *intra Decennium* when I was consecrated Bishop. I was well received and well treated in Rome, and provided for with suitable habiliments to appear as a Bishop and every other necessary appendage.

During my residence I found that a certain Society had represented the Gent. who had been appointed to administer the Diocese in my absence as a great man whose services were indispensably required *in prasentibus Ecclesiae Ph. adjunctis,* in consequence of which I found a willingness among them that I should remain until everything should be settled. This determined me to start immediately for Philadelphia.

After coming to Paris where I stayed two weeks, I still had got further notice from the Nuncio, to continue there, and I should get a *Pensio congrua durante mea absentia ab America;* nothing however had been sent by way of subsidium, whilst in the meantime I found a considerable "damnum emergens" in consequence of my absence, and having a letter from General Jackson sent to me from Rome as an answer to a congratulatory letter I had written to him wherein the General desiring me to come home without delay, I came here immediately at the time when you had been gone and Mr. Harold were both on the high seas. I can no more but hope you will write on receipt of this and let me know how you both are. The Boat is going off and I have only to tell you in great haste that the Reverend Thomas Carbry sailed from New York for Havre in October in a dying state and that he had in his possession 5,000 dollars and breathed his last on the 20th day of the Passage, without being able to make any kind of will.

I have the honour to be with great respect and wishing you every blessing, My dear & Reverend Sir, your sincere and faithful friend.

✠Henry Conwell,
Bishop of Philadelphia.

P. S. I live here as usual in my own apartments and refuse

to exercise Episcopal jurisdiction until Mr. M. is relieved from the Onus. The Bishops met in council in October where I had the pleasure of seeing myself quasi personated by another in my own presence; a novel circumstance. God bless you, write and give me every news, if you have any regarding myself. Excuse inaccuracies. Ever yours as above, Adieu.

To: The Reverend John Ryan, at the Dominican Convent, Cork, Ireland.

In its letter to Dr. Kenrick of March 13, 1830, Propaganda made it very clear that while his title was that of Bishop of Arath, and coadjutor to Dr. Conwell, he was to consider himself the Ordinary of the Diocese, "auctoritatem omnem ac potestatem jurisdictionis habeas veluti si actu Philadelphiensis episcopus ipse esses".[29] On this same day, Propaganda informed Dr. Conwell that his act of disobedience in returning to Philadelphia had been pardoned by the Holy Father, but that he was to abstain from the exercise of all episcopal jurisdiction, except in such cases as Bishop Kenrick should request.

Dr. Conwell's reply to Cardinal Cappellari, the Prefect of the Sacred Congregation, was a protest against the whole measure taken by Rome for the pacification of spiritual affairs in Philadelphia. He reminded the Cardinal-Prefect that he had never abdicated and never would; that his health was excellent; that he had made the journey to Bardstown and back without difficulty; and that the way in which Dr. Kenrick was chosen was uncanonical and would bring no good to religion. It was not, he averred, a pleasant thing to have the coadjutor exercising all prerogatives in the diocese as if he, Conwell, were dead: "*quasi mortuus fuissem*". He reported several absences of courtesy on Dr. Kenrick's part, such as failing to ask his blessing before preaching; and Dr. Conwell warned Propaganda that he still had the civil courts of Pennsylvania as a refuge in case it was necessary to assert his prior rights over the younger bishop.

The only charitable thing to do is to draw a veil over these initial years of Bishop Kenrick's episcopate in Philadelphia. Dr. Conwell not only wrote practically every week to Propaganda protesting against Kenrick on every conceivable ground, but began undermining Bishop Kenrick's authority with the rebellious trus-

[29]Prop. Arch., *Lettere*, vol. 311, fol. 198.

tees of St. Mary's. One letter from Dr. Kenrick to Archbishop Whitfield dated May 17, 1831, explains the situation at that time:

> The new machinations of an Anti-Catholic conspiracy force me to solicit a Certificate under your hand of the powers entrusted to me by the Holy See. The painful measure which I felt it necessary to adopt to remedy an evil that was likely to prove desperate, has not hitherto been followed by any tumult or excitement. The miserable remains of the Schismatical faction have murmured, whilst the great body of Catholics and even Protestants have viewed them with disgust and contempt. The gates of St. Mary's are thrown open on every Sunday, and the few Ring-leaders and some devoted partisans assemble in the Church yard to complain and to plot; whilst the Catholic Churches are crowded to excess.
>
> Last Friday, 7 of the Trustees assembled and assumed the title of a Board, and took the lock off the Church, as the Sexton refused delivering up the key. Dr. Conwell to my great affliction was with them for a very considerable time, and is said to have presented to them a paper, asserting his rights and powers as Bishop of Phila. and attributing to me persecution and usurpation. This is surely a new Tribunal to which Bishops are to resort for the redress of their grievances! It is feared that he will be weak enough to officiate in the Church, and perhaps to tamper with Rev. Dr. Kieley. I still hope that this will not be the case. Yet the frequent interviews which for some weeks past he has had with them have given great scandal to the Friends of Religion, and some confidence to the Children of discord who frequently say: "We know no Bishop of Phila. but Dr. Conwell. Dr. K. is Bishop of Arath. We know him not." The fact of my authority is nevertheless palpable to all; yet the weakness of Dr. C. and the artifices of the Disturbers convince me that every shadow of doubt should be removed, and that my authority should be established in such a way that even the Civil Tribunals could not make it a matter of question. Your Certificate is desired for the purpose of publishing it, should a Pamphlet appear questioning my authority, or should the assertions of the Trustees get coloring from the connivance of the unfortunate Bishop of Phila. No one is more desirous than I am to shelter him from infamy, and to provide for the honor and happiness of his old age. Yet I am convinced that the Security of Church property, some of which may otherwise pass to Columbus Conwell, and the peace and good government of the Diocess, render it necessary to take from him the temptation of his title. I shall therefore apply to the Holy See to transfer his title, and

create him Bishop *in partibus*, so that he may still have competent support here and the honors of a Bishop, but no pretext of disturbance. I do this with the more confidence as I feel actuated by no ambition. Were it at my option the Mitre would soon be resigned, and exchanged for retirement, or the Mission. I apprize you of this, that you may freely and speedily state to the Holy See your conscientious views on the subject. I know you will be guided only by a regard for the true interests of Religion, and I should be sorry to attempt to bias your judgment. I shall address your suffragans on the same subject. In accepting the office which I hold, I was aware that I surrendered myself to many sorrows and perils; but I relied on the power of God who called me, and on the active and firm support of my Colleagues in the Episcopacy, whose voice was for me the mark of the divine vocation. Your kind feelings and favourable opinion were for me a pledge of your determination to afford me all the aid of your authority, conformably to the instruction of the Holy See. In your Certificate I beg of you to state that the Episcopal jurisdiction has not been restored to Dr. C. but that all power and authority of jurisdiction are vested in me exclusively by the Apostolic see.[30]

In New Orleans, the trustees who had given Bishop Du Bourg so much trouble during his episcopate (1815-1826), became bolder in the assertion of their temporal and spiritual rights over the Cathedral after his departure. But when Father Anthony de Sedella, the storm center in New Orleans, died on January 19, 1829, and was buried with a Freemasonic funeral of grandiose proportions, a period of comparative peace set in for the Louisiana Church.[31] Bishop Rosati was Administrator of the Diocese of New Orleans until the consecration of Bishop De Neckere on May 24, 1830. Three years later (September 5, 1833), De Neckere died, and Rev. Augustine Jeanjean, who was chosen to succeed him, declined the honor. Bishop Anthony Blanc succeeded on November 22, 1835.

During the years 1829-1834, the Diocese of Bardstown underwent changes that aroused some curiosity at the time. Bishop Flaget had ruled that diocese from 1810 to 1817, when Bishop John

[30]BCA—Case 23—K7.

[31]Cf. Gassler, *Père Antoine, Supreme Officer of the Holy Inquisition of Cartagena, in Louisiana,* in the *Cath. Hist. Rev.*, vol. II, pp. 59-63; Wyatt, *Fray Antonio De Sedella,* in the *Louisiana Historical Quarterly*, vol. II, pp. 24-37. The details of the remarkable funeral are in the *Cath. Misc.*, vol. VIII, pp. 247-261.

Baptist David was appointed his coadjutor. After the departure of Bishop Kenrick for Philadelphia (1830), Bishop Flaget felt that the burden of the diocese was too heavy for his shoulders—he was then approaching his sixty-eighth year, and Bishop David was two years older—and in consequence he offered his resignation to the Holy See. In view of the advanced age of Bishop David, Dr. Flaget proposed Father Ignatius Chabrat as his successor. In December, 1832, Pope Gregory XVI accepted his resignation, and Bishop David became Bishop of Bardstown by right of succession. Dr. Flaget was then appointed by Bishop David to the Vicar-Generalship of the diocese, and immediately afterwards Bishop David sent his own resignation to the Holy See. In May, 1833, the documents arrived from Rome, accepting David's resignation and reappointing Bishop Flaget to the See of Bardstown. After accepting the post, Dr. Flaget again asked for Father Chabrat as his coadjutor, and on June 19, 1834, the Bulls arrived. Bishop Chabrat was consecrated on July 20, 1834, in the Bardstown Cathedral.

Even in the presence of all these varied and complex problems affecting the Church in the United States at this time, the prelates who met on October 20, 1833, for the convocation of the Second Provincial Council of Baltimore were cognizant that the four years which had intervened had been momentous ones in the history of Catholic progress in the nation. One by one the older priests, who linked the Jacksonian era with that of Washington and Jefferson had passed away, and their places were filled with young, native, and devoted missionaries who were not only abreast of America's political development but were also leaders in the social and cultural education of their people. These years witnessed the rise of a native clergy in the American Church, and it cannot be stressed too strongly the providential factor a priesthood of American birth and education was in the next two decades when the floodtide of immigration reached proportions which no one could have foreseen. The swift and thorough amalgamation of the newcomers into American customs and American political philosophy has often been described, but seldom in terms of the potent factor the Catholic priesthood was in its permanency. Dominant in this Catholic contribution to the national progress was the work of the seven Provincial Councils during these crowded years (1829-1849).

CHAPTER XXVI

The Second Provincial Council of Baltimore

(October 20-27, 1833)

The first note regarding the Synod of 1833 in Dr. England's correspondence is in his letter to Pope Gregory XVI, dated July 23, 1831, congratulating His Holiness on his election to the papacy. After discussing the causes for the disturbed condition of the Church here, Dr. England begs the Pope not to consider his suggestions for the proper ordering of ecclesiastical affairs in America as presumptuous. The Holy Father should know that there has always been at the center of church discipline here a group of priests who believe that they are very well informed in the language, genius, customs and laws of this country; but the administration of the Church here is a proof that they are sorely mistaken. The surest means of promoting church progress was through Provincial Councils, and, if these were regularly held according to the mind of the Council of Trent, ecclesiastical life would prosper.[1]

On April 3, 1832, Propaganda wrote to Archbishop Whitfield, stating that the geographical units of the American Sees should be more accurately defined by a Provincial Council. This problem had been raised by the Bishops of St. Louis and of New York, and Dr. Whitfield was asked to consult with his suffragans on the matter.[2] Accordingly the archbishop wrote to the bishops on June 6, asking them to define the limits of their respective Sees. Apparently, in this letter, the archbishop stated that he did not intend to call a Council, as had been decreed by the bishops in 1829. Dr. England's answer was as follows:

> Your letter of the 6th inst., has been just now received. I hasten to answer your two questions—so as to enable you to answer the Cardinal-Prefect.
>
> 1. The Diocess of Charleston is bounded on the North by the line which separates North Carolina and Virginia; on the West by the line which separates North Carolina from Tennessee and

[1]Prop. Arch., *Scritt. rifer., Amer. Cent.*, vol. 10, no. 8.
[2]*Ibid., Lettere*, vol. 313, fol. 291.

Georgia from Alabama; on the South by the river St. Mary's and the other line thence continued separating the State of Georgia from the Territory of Florida; and on the East by the Atlantic Ocean. It comprises three States: North Carolina, South Carolina and Georgia.

2. The coterminous prelates are: On the North, the Archbishop of Baltimore as administrator of the See of Richmond; on the west, the Bishop of Bardstown as far as the State of Tennessee extends; thence the Bishop of Mobile; and on the South the Bishop of Mobile. I am not aware of any doubt on either their part or mine of the questions of boundary or the questions of jurisdiction.

Will you allow me to use the present opportunity to suggest with all deference: First: my perfect dissent from your prorogation of the provincial council; I have myself matters more than difficult and of a perfectly unobjectional character to any one of my brethren, which I consider highly necessary to be submitted to a council, and totally useless to submit to the individual prelate, or to Rome, in the first instance. I know that great good has been effected by the former council, and great evil prosecuted. I would expect much greater benefit from another. Second: If you still continue to object to the assembling of the council this year, I would request of you (without concurring in the propriety of the prorogation) to prorogue it canonically by sending to each of the Prelates, a notice, that for weighty reasons, which you may or may not express (though I conceive they ought to be expressed), you do according to the provisions of the canon of adjournment, prorogue the assembling of the Council to a time which you will name. Believe me that this suggestion is not dictated by any intention either to give you pain or embarrassment, but quite the contrary. I feel myself, for instance, canonically bound by the prorogation to attend on the first of October, unless I am canonically released; your summons is not necessary; for it is an act of the council confirmed by the Pope and pointing out only one mode of avoiding the meeting. My request then is simply that if contrary to my opinion and advice you determine to prevent the meeting you should prevent it in a proper and regular manner.[3]

On June 18, 1832, Dr. England wrote again to Whitfield announcing his approaching departure for Ireland to secure financial help and priests for Charleston.

Should I go to Rome [he writes], and there make any state-

[3]BCA—Case 23A—D1.

ment respecting the general affairs of the Province, I wish it to be distinctly understood by you that I am aware of only one difference of opinion between us. You do not see the benefits produced by our Councils. I think I see many, and am of the opinion that you have, by holding it, not only prevented great evils, but laid the foundation of much good. You do not seem disposed to continue their celebration. I am most desirous for their being regularly held. I know of no other difference of opinion, and I wish to express fully and openly to you that this is probably the only subject not regarding my own diocess exclusively which I am likely to introduce, if I should have the happiness to go to the Holy City. This difference of opinion neither diminishes our mutual affection or respect, and I believe your motives to be the best and purest.[4]

It was during the month he spent in Ireland, as we have already seen, that Dr. England succeeded in arranging with the Irish hierarchy a method whereby his own diocese and the other dioceses of the Baltimore Province might be regularly supplied with an efficient clergy. On September 18, 1832, he wrote to Dr. Whitfield, and all the bishops of the United States, informing them of the plan and pointing out the way by which they might profit by the new arrangement. This letter, which is printed in full in a previous chapter, outlined an admirable method for supplying the churches in the United States, but it met with no response, since the plan involved the augmentation of Irish priests in the country.

The death of Bishop Fenwick of Cincinnati on September 26, 1832, again focussed attention upon a problem on which the Council of 1829 had not afforded any efficient legislation, and one that had caused considerable uneasiness from Archbishop Carroll's day: the mode of nominating to vacant American Sees. On November 24, 1832, Propaganda wrote to Dr. Whitfield expressing its sorrow over the death of Fenwick and its wish to fill the vacant See of Cincinnati as quickly as possible, "*novum illius dioecesis episcopum quantocitius fieri potest eligere*". He was asked, therefore, to forward three names to Rome at the earliest opportunity. So far as Rome was concerned, the policy of the Sacred Congregation by this time was to permit the American hierarchy to select its own candidates. The method here, however, was somewhat involved. Letters

[4]BCA—Case 23A—D2.

left Baltimore to the prelates, some of whom would be on Visitations at long distances from their homes. Much time, usually a year, would be required before all the names could be sent to Baltimore. The archbishop would then make up a *terna* and, before sending this to Rome, would inform the bishops of the result of his vote taken.

A new factor entered into the selection of Fenwick's successor, and that was Dr. England's presence in Rome. A month before his death (August 22, 1832), Bishop Fenwick wrote to the archbishop asking him to unite with him in having Father Kenney, S. J., of Georgetown College, then the Superior of the Jesuits, appointed his coadjutor. If he could obtain this favor from the Holy See, he meant to recommend the Vicar-General of Cincinnati, Frederic Rese, for the proposed See of Detroit.[5]

On December 22, 1832, the Cardinal-Prefect of Propaganda, Pedicini, informed Father Rese that he had been appointed administrator of the Diocese of Cincinnati in the interim. Three days later Dr. England arrived in Rome, and frankly told the Holy See that there was a generally expressed opinion abroad at the time among the clergy and laity that the future of Catholicism in the United States was being jeopardized by the continued appointment of others than Americans to American Sees.[6] Some of the current gossip is found in Dr. England's letter to Rosati, dated Rome, January 14, 1833:

> I wrote to you from Ireland, after which I came through England to France, where in Lyons & Paris I had some explanations with the society of the Propaganda, & got some aid from the Archbishop of Paris. Thence I went through Switzerland and Bavaria to Vienna, but unfortunately for my object, which was to get money, too late, as in October they had divided between Cincinnati and Baltimore, giving to the first 25,000, and to the second 15,000. . . . They knew scarcely anything of our situation; I at their request wrote a statement of all our Diocesses which occupied me ten days and gave them some notion of our relative wants and difficulties. . . . In addition

[5]O'Daniel, *Fenwick*, p. 421; Lamott, *op. cit.*, p. 70.

[6]Prop. Arch., *Scritt rifer., Amer. Cent.*, vol. 2, fol. 424. Conwell to Cicognani, Phil., Jan. 1, 1833, says that the French bishops and clergy in the United States went by the name "Bats," which arose apparently from Taylor's indiscreet sermon at Dubois' consecration in Baltimore, October 28, 1826.

I had the No. of the *Annales* of Lyons that had your letters and those of your clergy upon the state of your missions, and I gave them this, stating also what I knew to be your labours. . . . I would advise you in addition to write yourself to his highness the Prince Archbishop of Vienna who is President of the Leopoldinen Stiftung, & who is a very good man,—and disposed to aid us.—My letters given to the Austrian Consul in New York did not reach here. I think you had better send Post-paid to New York to go by Havre, or send to some friend to France to post your letter there. The Nuncio, Ostini, helped me much to excite their zeal, & presented me to the emperor to thank him for his kindness in permitting the society to exist, and to the king of Hungary, to thank him for being its protector, and went with me to Prince Metternich for a similar purpose. . . . Now for news. I suppose you know long since of the resignation of our good father of Bardstown, that it has been accepted, & that David is now Bishop of Bardstown, and our senior suffragan, and Chabrat his Coadjutor.—Blanc's resignation has also been accepted & De Nekere will get no Coadjutor, but must do his own duty.—Detroit will be separated from Cincinnati and made a See, of which Rese will, I think be Bishop. . . . Jeanjean has had his passport stolen in France, was kept under a long quarantine in the first Italian port, put into prison at Civita Vecchia, locked out by your friends the Lazarists, for not being home in time when he was at Propaganda, & was taken in the Propaganda, where he now is. . . . He tells me that you want to have the Missions on the Western side of Illinois added to your Diocess, which you already describe as the largest in the whole world. I was amused at the semblance of a reason that he gave & the seriousness with which he urged it, viz.—that you could not easily go through your own Diocess to your Seminary if this was in another Diocess.[7] I was asked by Castracane my opinion of it. I said that I suspected you were very fond of Missions for which you had done so much, & that they were, & ought to be very fond of you. & that this was the only reason I saw for giving them to you, if Vincennes was ever to be made a See,—that it would be folly to make a

[7]The reason brought forth by Jeanjean was a little different from what Bishop England understood, and not so ridiculous as it appeared to him. Rosati's argument was that these places (Cahokia, Prairie du Rocher, Kaskaskia) were near St. Louis, and indeed on the *only* highroad between St. Louis and St. Genevieve (which went through Illinois) and, therefore, the seminary. The Bishop could not visit that portion of his diocese without passing through those places. Bishop England was not sufficiently acquainted with the locations; hence his misunderstanding. (Note furnished me by Dr. Souvay.)

See of it now, if these were taken away, that it was exceedingly inconvenient to divide a State between two Diocesses, that it would at a future day give rise to similar disputes as now exist between New York and Philadelphia respecting New Jersey, and though I would prefer if you approved of it, giving Illinois & Indiana to Vincennes & making a new See,—yet that I would never wish to give you a moment's pain, & therefore perhaps it would be as well for the present to give you the whole of Illinois & to give Indiana to Cincinnati for that they could not be better minded than by you & that the Bishop of Bardstown thus would perhaps be enabled to do something for Tennessee. I added that these were *only my notions*, & that I was by no means friendly to having decisions made upon the statements of one or two individuals, that my advice would be, to have all these questions examined in Provincial Councils & after receiving their report and advice, Rome would safely decide. —I think it fair to state openly to you what I said, so that if it be not too late you may correct it. I told the same to Jean-jean.—

Now as to Cincinnati. The Jesuits are working hard to prevent Kenney's being named to its charge: the Dominicans are working equally hard to have it made an apanage of their order and are proposing Mr. Miles. Kenrick has written to me to say you wished——, but he appears to have been disposed of.—Purcell of Emmitsburg was mentioned also by Kenrick, & though I mentioned nothing to any one in authority, as I was asked nothing, I was thinking of Power of New York. But as yet it is impossible for any one to see his way through the case.—

Blanc's resignation has been accepted and De Neckere must do his duty whether he will or not, as he will get no Coadjutor.

I have now to inform you of my perfect disappointment at the conduct of our good Archbishop; and to say that notwithstanding all my affection & respect for him, I can not be satisfied with the manner in which he has treated his suffragans and the canon of the former provincial council sanctioned by the Holy See, by which we were to have met in last October.—Before I came hither, I suspected that he might have got some secret instructions upon the subject, & that Rome did not wish us to meet.—Here I was asked upon the subject & I enquired, & find that the opinion is exactly in unison with that which I always entertained, which is that of the Council of Trent, that these Provincial Councils are most useful & that Rome is ready to give every aid in her power to enable

us to proceed with the good that has been commenced.—I stated that I neither was nor could be content with the way in which the Province was managed without common consultation, & that if I did not err greatly my brethren generally thought with me, that great good was done by our last synod, & that the repetition would be attended by the most salutary consequences.—Yet that unfortunately the Archbishop could not be persuaded that any good was done by the last or would arise from others, that I loved & respected him for his virtues & his good intentions, but that I could not sacrifice my judgement nor betray my duty.—I then showed the benefits which arose from the Council, & proceeded to show how though we had Unity of doctrine we had no unity of action. Our opponents had their monthly, yearly & triennial meetings of Presbyteries, Synods, Assemblies, Conferences, Conventions & Societies, by means of which they had common counsel, unity of action, concentrated force, & powerful influence as well as public respect, whilst they by adopting this catholic principle of ancient discipline were daily & yearly growing compact, soothing their jealousies & collecting large means which they applied to common objects after common consultation, we were a parcel of disunited congregations, having no common consultation, no unity of action, no rallying point, growing daily more jealous, & more divided, & having no practical union. That I was tired, & disheartened at this which I knew would constitute only an occasion of discontent even for those who without speaking would reflect.—I was told that it was plain the councils would remove jealousies, produce harmony, & make us have common counsel & common action & make us more powerful and respected, & that Rome would be glad to have those effects produced,—that if we did not meet, the fault was our own, & that we had only either to procure the synod to be called at home or to express to the Holy See our wish to have it assemble, & that it would exert its power for the purpose.—

I have given you a faithful extract, & now call upon you to say before God whether I have spoken wrong.—I beg you will give your opinion to the Propaganda as to what I have stated, and let it be able by your testimony to judge whether I have been in error or not.—I know you too well to doubt your zeal for the welfare of the church, & if you think that welfare will be promoted by having a synod called, I know you care as little as any other for the labour necessary in promoting the glory of God & the prosperity of his Church.[8]

[8]From the St. Louis Diocesan Chancery Archives.

At a Special Congregation of Propaganda on American affairs held on February 25, 1833, three problems were discussed: the diocesan limits of the Sees here; the vacant See of Cincinnati and the proposed See of Detroit; and the erection of the new See of Vincennes. Purcell was elected Bishop of Cincinnati and Rese was chosen for Detroit, while the proposed Diocese of Vincennes was postponed for the time being. In case it was erected, Father Bruté was to be chosen as its bishop.

In the *Atti* for this meeting of the Cardinals are several schedules drawn up by the officials of Propaganda with Dr. England's assistance for the purpose of giving a graphic description of the Church in the United States.[9] The limits of the dioceses are marked out. This is followed by a table showing the distribution of the population in 1833. To this is added a diagram showing the number of Catholic institutions in the United States:

1. *Diocese of Baltimore*

Two Colleges (Sulpician)	Two Colleges (Jesuits)
One College (secular clergy—Emmitsburg)	One Convent of the Visitation Nuns
One Convent of Carmelites	Eight Houses of the Sisters of Charity
One House of the Sisters of Providence	77 Priests

2. *Diocese of Boston*

One Convent of Ursulines	One House of the Sisters of Charity
Two Indian Missions	15 Priests
20 churches	

3. *Diocese of New York*

Four Houses of the Sisters of Charity	One Indian Mission
16 Churches	100,000 Catholics
	18 Priests

4. *Diocese of Philadelphia*

One Convent of Poor Clares	50 Churches
One Mission of Augustinian Fathers	38 Priests
	100,000 Catholics

[9]Prop. Arch., *Scritt. rifer., Amer. Cent.*, vol. 11, not folioed. The English original is in the Irish College *Portfolio*, and is printed in the *Records* (ACHS), vol. VIII, pp. 317-329.

5. *Diocese of Cincinnati*

Three Missions of the Dominican Fathers
One House of the Sisters of Charity
One Mission of the Redemptorist Fathers
25 Priests
One Convent of Dominican Sisters
One Seminary (secular clergy)
33 Churches
3 Indian Missions with 7 churches

6. *Diocese of Bardstown*

Two Colleges (Secular Clergy)
One Jesuit College
One Convent of Dominican Nuns
Six Houses of the Loretto Nuns
One Seminary
28 Priests
One Dominican House
Seven Houses of the Sisters of Nazareth
25 Churches

7. *Diocese of St. Louis*

One House of the Congregation of the Missions (Barrens)
Three Houses of the Sisters of the Sacred Heart
Four Houses of the Loretto Sisters
One Jesuit College (Florissant)
One House of the Sisters of Charity
20 Churches
39 Priests

8. *Diocese of New Orleans*

One Convent of Ursuline Nuns
Two Houses of the Sisters of the Sacred Heart
One House of the Sisters of Charity
23 Churches

9. *Diocese of Mobile*

One Seminary
5 Churches
One College (Spring Hill)
9 Priests

10. *Diocese of Charleston*

"Il Mons. Vescovo di questa Diocesi stando ore in Roma, sarà meglio di reservare le notizie particolari della sua Diocese a Lui medesimo."

Dr. England was a focus of interest in Rome during the months he remained there, and from the extant correspondence it is evident that Propaganda was depending upon Cardinal Weld to secure from the Bishop of Charleston every available information on the state of religious affairs in the United States. Some time before he left for home, Dr. England wrote to the Sacred Congregation

(June 16, 1833) stating that he wished in all humility and firmness to impress upon Propaganda the fact that the best means for establishing discipline in the American Church was by means of Provincial Councils held regularly according to the Decrees of Trent. In this way each bishop would be free to express his opinion on church matters without danger of arousing jealousy or enmity. All the bishops admitted that the last Council (1829) had produced splendid results, but all were aware that influences were at work on the archbishop's mind to do away with the Councils altogether—"*Maximo cum dolore vereor, non nostro consensu, sed aliunde consilium initum fuisse, ne in posterum synodi teneantur*". Nowhere in the world was there a more zealous hierarchy, he says, but some of the bishops for the sake of peace, were fearful of insisting upon these triennial meetings.[10]

The second Provincial Council should have met in October, 1832, but the prelates knew during the summer that Dr. Whitfield had no intention of convoking the assembly.

Dr. Fenwick, Dr. England, Dr. Rosati, and Dr. Kenrick were beginning to be alarmed over the influence of St. Mary's Seminary on the mind of the archbishop. They were not aware of Propaganda's letter of May 4, 1833, doubtless written through Bishop England's influence while in Rome, to the effect that the Sacred Congregation wished the problem of the diocesan limits discussed in the next Provincial Council which it hoped would be held as soon as possible. This was in accordance with the wish of the Holy Father, who reminded Dr. Whitfield of the splendid effects of the Council of 1829 and of its wise provision to call the bishops together within three years: ". . . . *ut quamprimum fieri poterit novum concilium provinciale Baltimorense habeatur . . . . Meminet Sanctissimus Dominus Noster quanto cum fructu provinciale primum Baltimorense concilium mense Octobris anno 1829 . . . . celebratum sit, atque illud etiam recordatur sapienter in ea Synodo statutum esse ut provinciale concilium post triennium haberetur. Cum igitur triennium jam lapsum fuerit, cumque gravia negotia simul perpendanda in promptu sint, certum habet Sanctitas sua te curaturum ut nova Synodus quanto citius poterit rite celebretur.*"[11]

[10] *Ibid., Atti,* May, 1833, fol. 183.
[11] *Ibid., Lettere,* vol. 314, fol. 378.

After the receipt of this request from the Holy See, Archbishop Whitfield proceeded at once though against his own will to summon the bishops for the following autumn. Dr. England wrote to Whitfield from Rome, May 14, 1833:

> Being about to conclude my visit, and take my departure from this city, I think it right to inform you of what has occurred in regard to our common concerns so far as I know the facts.—My object in coming hither was altogether for the purpose of procuring aid for my own diocess and in this I have been rather unsuccessful, not only here but in Lyons and Vienna.—I have however got a colony of Ursuline nuns in Cork, who will accompany me upon my return, and also some candidates for orders.—I did not intend saying anything upon the general concerns of our Province, but was called upon by the Propaganda to give my opinion upon several subjects and was of course thus led to enter at some length upon topics which I intended to avoid.
>
> In the first place the questions respecting the boundaries of Diocesses and the nominations to sees.—Mr. Jeanjean was here on the part of Doctor Rosati and sought to get a portion of the West of Illinois added to St. Louis, and a See erected at Vincennes. I stated that if the See was to be erected, and I thought it desirable, I believed the proposed division inexpedient, as it would take from Vincennes nearly all the Catholic population of Illinois and create an immense disproportion between the Diocesses. I thought it better not to have a final decision made until the matter should have been examined in our Provincial Council. I have no recommendation for the promotions. Doctor Fenwick (Cincinnati) had recommended that Rese should be consecrated for Detroit and Kenney be given as his coadjutor for Cincinnati. Doctors Flaget and Rosati sustained this after his death and added that if Kenney could not be appointed, Hughes of Philadelphia should be for Cincinnati. Dr. Kenrick recommended Purcell. I stated that I thought each of them well fitted for the place, and that they could not be wrong in the nomination of either.—The general of the Jesuits opposed Kenney—and in the congregation of March when the Pope presided, Rese was named for Detroit and Purcell for Cincinnati. Purcell's papers were kept back, as the question regarding Vincennes was not decided, and it might affect Cincinnati. Meantime your letter was received giving other names to which the general of the Jesuits gave decided and effectual opposition. I added that Purcell's nomination was known in the United States, and you were not aware of it when you wrote, and that it would be unpleasant to be so frequently

changing the nominations.—On Sunday evening, the Pope desired Monsignor Mai, the new Secretary (Castracane is a Cardinal) to forward the papers to Purcell.

Drs. Flaget and Rosati recommended Bruté for Vincennes, but I believe nothing will be done on this until after our Council, should you not still oppose its assembling.

The opposition made by the clergy and people of Bardstown to Chabrat's nomination, the refusal of Blanc to accept the condjutorship of New Orleans and a variety of other considerations have led here to the determination of adopting some fixed and practicable plan for ascertaining the sentiments of the clergy and bishops before making nominations in future to our Sees. I was asked my opinion, and said that I was convinced the principle would be extremely useful, but that I preferred consulting with the Prelates of the Province, previous to giving any plan for the consideration of the Propaganda. The Pope seems to consider some plan of this sort imperatively called for. A question of dispensing with the abstinence of Saturdays and of St. Mark and the Rogations will come on next Monday before the general congregation of the Propaganda, as also that of the boundaries of the Diocesses, the erection of the See at Vincennes and two others suggested by me.—First: the propriety of creating a special mission for the Indians now to be located in the West outside the actual Diocesses, and placing it under bishops *in partibus*, and having Jeanjean, who wishes to devote himself to Indian missions, the first bishop.—Second: the establishment of a Mission of Liberia. I have recommended that no final decision be made, but that they be referred to our Council, to report its opinion, —I am under the impression that such is likely to be the decision of the Propaganda.

In various conversations with His Holiness, Cardinal Pedicini, Cardinal Castracane, Monsignor Mai, and Cardinal Weld, I distinctly stated my regret at the impression on your mind that little good was done by our Council and your reluctance to see us reassemble.—I said that my impressions were altogether different from yours and that I thought many, if not most, of our brethren felt as I did. The Pope in particular, desired me to say, that if you did not see good results from the Council, he at least did, and that it was his wish that we should meet as frequently as we could.—I found the sentiments of all the others to be in perfect union with those of his Holiness. I now repeat what I always expressed to the Pope and the others in authority here—that I have the greatest regret at this difference of opinion upon so important a topic with an Archbishop who has joined the purest zeal and commenced

his administration by doing an act of such evident benefit to the Province over which he has been placed. I should hope, as I believe, that it is our only difference.—And I should trust that whatever causes might have appeared to you sufficient to defer the assembly have passed away, and that perhaps whilst I write you are calling us together. I was thrice told by His Holiness that his request to that effect should be forwarded to you. In expressing the difference of our opinion upon this point, of course, I felt it to be my duty to express my own reasons, and to do full justice to your motives which I suppose and believe to be the best.

His Holiness has given to me a commission which I did not feel at liberty to refuse, though its execution will be to me exceedingly inconvenient, and probably the result a disappointment. As yet, it is not desirable to have it made very public—It is to proceed to St. Domingo for the purpose of endeavoring to discover and to remedy its present evils so far as regards ecclesiastical authority, and to report to the Holy See the facts that I shall observe with my own opinion.

This is the best summary that I can give of what has occurred here respecting our Province. I may congratulate you and our brethren on the standing which the proceedings of our Council have secured to us here. They have been reprinted this last week for the use of the Cardinals of the Propaganda for their next congregation.

I had hoped to have reached Ireland before now, on my return, but the Holy Father prevents my departure for another week at least. I have now no hopes of seeing my family before July; and shall try to sail for the United States at the end of August.—Would to God that I could promise myself to meet you and my brethren again assembled in October! Perhaps I might.

No successor has yet been appointed for poor Doctor Gradwell, whom I saw in London, last October; Dr. Griffith is spoken of; some think him too old, and Dr. Wiseman too young.

I have been for a fortnight to Naples, and though I had a letter to the queen from her sister, it did me no good. I was left to enjoy the scenery and Vesuvius and Pompeii without being troubled with going to obtain aid for my poor church.—I, however, saw evidently the liquifaction of the Blood of St. Januarius.

My coming to Italy has I trust been very useful to myself, if not to my Diocess, for it has afforded me much opportunity of receiving edification and instruction; and I may say dissi-

pated prejudices under which I laboured and greatly increased my veneration and attachment to the Holy See.[12]

In reporting to Propaganda the results of his conversation with Dr. England, Cardinal Weld stated (May 17, 1833) that the following points were decided upon:

1. That diocesan limits should coincide as far as possible with State boundaries.
2. That in time each State should become a separate diocese.
3. That new dioceses be formed as soon as the Catholics in each State were able to provide for a bishop.
4. That every three years a Provincial Council should be held and that the acts and decrees of the Synod be sent to Rome for approval before they are promulgated.
5. That with these acts and decrees a detailed memorandum be drawn up by the bishops on the progress of the Church during the three years previous to the Council.
6. That in each Provincial Council the question of erecting new Sees be given full consideration.
7. That in each Provincial Council the names of suitable candidates for vacant or new Sees be discussed in open assembly.
8. That an audit be sent to Rome upon all financial aid given the American dioceses by the Sacred Congregation.[13]

On May 21, 1833, the Sacred Congregation made use of these suggestions in a letter to Archbishop Whitfield and stressed the special necessity of providing a means of filling vacant Sees promptly in the same system used by the Irish hierarchy.[14]

The archbishop, however, did not mean to allow Dr. England's influence in Rome to direct the Province. From the few letters that have been preserved it is evident that he highly resented the interference of the Bishop of Charleston. One such letter, written in Italian, and addressed to Nicholas Wiseman, June 6, 1833, is an appeal from one Englishman to another, to prevent the growing power of the Irish clergy in this country. The plans of Bishop England and Kenrick were very clear in the archbishop's eyes. They were both of an impetuous Celtic nature and wished to see

[12]BCA—Case 23—G5.
[13]Prop. Arch., *Scritt. rifer., Amer. Cent.*, vol. 11.
[14]*Ibid., Lettere*, vol. 314, fol. 410.

the Church in the United States governed by prelates of their race and regulated by the same discipline as the Church in Ireland. This was why they had recommended Purcell for Cincinnati. They had been busy all the past year, "*per mezzo di publicazione nei loro giornali*" (in the *Catholic Herald* and the *Miscellany*), in practically forcing Whitfield to convoke a Provincial Council. He had opposed the assembly of the bishops because Dr. England's turbulent disposition might work damage to the disciplinary regulations of the American Church, either by his insistence upon Irish methods or by the infiltration of his democratic ideas of church government.

Knowing that Dr. England would insist at Rome upon the Council, Whitfield told Wiseman that he had written to the Sacred Congregation saying that he would not convoke the Synod unless expressly ordered to do so by Rome. He was not averse to the nomination of prelates of the Irish race, but he feared that a preponderance of Irish bishops would bring to the country too many Irish priests. His own care in excluding Irish clergymen from the Diocese of Baltimore was the source of its peace and quiet, while in Philadelphia and New York, where the clergy were exclusively Irish, disunion and disorder prevailed. Propaganda ought to know the danger Dr. England had brought to the unity of the American Church through the constitution which he had introduced into the Diocese of Charleston. Dr. England came often to Baltimore; too often for Whitfield's comfort, for the archbishop confesses in this letter that he was never very happy while the Bishop of Charleston was going about preaching and lecturing. Dr. England had recently written to him regarding a new scheme of supplying the American missions with priests from Maynooth and Carlow, but he would never consent to their entrance into Baltimore. He wanted no more foreign priests and especially no Irishmen. He regretted Purcell's election to Cincinnati because the three of them (England, Kenrick, and Purcell) would be of one mind on the matter of internal Church discipline. A final word is written upon the grave risk the Church runs in allowing Dr. England to model his ecclesiastical government upon American republican models. Dr. Wiseman was asked to present these reflections to Cardinal Pedicini and to say

that the Archbishop of Baltimore would not convoke a Council unless commanded to do so by Rome.[15]

During his stay in Ireland on the way back to Charleston, Dr. England was asked by Dr. Slattery, who had just been appointed President of Maynooth (1833), to allow the clergy of Cashel to present the name of the Bishop of Charleston for that Metropolitan See. Dr. England declined the honor for he had given his promise to the Holy Father to accept the Apostolic delegation to Haiti.[16] He wrote to Paul Cullen from Havre on August 16, 1833, that he intended to stay in the United States, "until at least I shall have failed in my efforts to place the Charleston Church upon a better footing than it is."[17]

On August 6, 1833, Dr. Whitfield wrote to Propaganda to say that he had obeyed the command of the Holy See and had convoked the Second Provincial Council for October 20, of that year. His own judgment was strongly against the assembly of the bishops, and he wished to repeat his conviction that no good would come of the meeting. But since the Holy Father had commanded, it would be carried out.[18]

On September 1, 1833, Paul Cullen wrote to Bishop Kenrick giving him the current ecclesiastical news at Rome. Dr. England, he says, had succeeded in fully persuading the Pope that it was absolutely necessary for the interests of the Catholic Church in America to hold frequent Councils there, and for the bishops to consult in common on the progress of religion and on the administration of ecclesiastical affairs. Since Dr. England's departure, His Holiness had often discussed with Cullen the opposition of the Archbishop of Baltimore, and had stated that the Holy See would welcome an annual assembly of the American bishops as the Irish prelates were doing at home. "Though the reasons given for holding Councils in America are so urgent, still all do not agree to

---

[15]*Ibid., Scritt. rifer., Amer. Cent.*, vol. 11, not folioed. After Gradwell's elevation to the episcopate in 1828, Nicholas Wiseman, then Vice-Rector of the English College, became Rector and continued Gradwell's agency for the Church in England and the United States. Cf. Gasquet, *The Venerable English College in Rome*, p. 223. London, 1920.

[16]Cf. Healy, *Maynooth College: its Centenary History*, p. 337. Dublin, 1895.

[17]Irish College *Portfolio*, p. 98.

[18]Prop. Arch., *Scritt. rifer., Amer. Cent.*, vol. 11.

them. The Archbishop of Baltimore is averse to holding them . . . I have been informed that his principal reason for opposing Councils is that he dreads the influence of Dr. England."[19]

"Philo-Canon" began about this time a series of articles on Diocesan Synods in the *Catholic Herald* of Philadelphia. These were copied by the *Miscellany* and by other Catholic papers, and ran through the year 1832. They kept the subject of the Provincial Council before the priests, and Dr. Whitfield complained about them, as we have seen, for they invoked ecclesiastical law at every turn and made marked application of its binding-power upon the Metropolitan. Such paragraphs as the following met his eyes from time to time:

> The Triennial assembly of the prelates cannot rigorously be insisted on as a matter of strict obligation, since the great distance of the prelates from the metropolis, and their many urgent duties to their flocks, render their frequent assembling almost impracticable. Yet again we admire the zeal of these venerable pastors to comply with the law, since one of the decrees of their first council determines their next assembly for the third year, unless the archbishop, for some *weighty reason*, should deem it necessary to defer it. That no such necessity may occur is to be devoutly wished by all who desire the complete organization of our church in these states, and the perfect uniformity of all ritual observances and discipline.
>
> The fathers of the provincial council of Cologne in the year 1549 call synods the terror of the enemies of the church, the great bulwarks of Catholic Faith, and the nerves of the Church herself.[20]

The decree of the Council of Trent (Session 24, de Ref., c. 2) is quoted in full as often as possible in the articles in order to emphasize the necessity of a triennial council; and, as the articles continued, the anonymous writer became specific in pointing out that there were various values for the Council: (1) "the settlement of the disordered affairs of some diocesses"; (2) "the election of the bishops"; (3) "the importance of giving Rome current and authentic information"; (4) "the redress of grievances"; and (5) "the erection of new diocesses."[21]

---

[19]BCA—Case 28—R2.
[20]*Cath. Misc.*, vol. XI, p. 242.
[21]*Ibid.*, pp. 174, 295, 340, 347, 362, 370, 378, 390.

The Second Provincial Council opened its sessions on Sunday, October 20, 1833, in the Baltimore Cathedral. Archbishop Whitfield celebrated Pontifical Mass, and at the end of the session Bishop England preached on the nature of church government, the utility of Provincial Councils, and the benefits likely to arise from their frequency in this country.

There were present: Bishops David, England, Rosati, Fenwick of Boston, Dubois, Portier, Francis P. Kenrick, Rese, and Purcell, who had been consecrated on October 13 by Archbishop Whitfield. On account of the long journey, Bishop Flaget was not present. The officials of the Council were: *Promoters:* Bishop Fenwick and Father Deluol, S.S., Vicar-General of the Archdiocese; *Secretaries:* Fathers Damphoux, Rector of the Cathedral, and John Hoskyne; *Master of Ceremonies:* Father Chanche; *Cantors:* Fathers Radanne and Fredet. The consulting theologians were the Jesuit and Dominican Provincials, Fathers William McSherry, S. J., and Nicholas D. Young, O.P.; Fathers Tessier, S.S., Jeanjean, Eccleston, De Barth, Andrew Byrne, Odin, Power, Mauverney, John Hughes, William Matthews, and Simon Bruté.[22]

Two sessions were held daily during the week of the Council, from nine till twelve in the morning and from four to six in the evening.

The *Miscellany* for October 19, 1833, contained an article explaining the nature and object of the Council and describing the duties of the bishops and the various officials; but nothing is said in succeeding issues regarding the legislation of the Council. Dr. England did not write a series of letters to the *Miscellany*, as he had done in 1829, the reason no doubt being the opposition he met with in all his proposals at the sessions of the assembly.

At the first session Archbishop Whitfield announced that Bishop Fenwick and Father Deluol, the Superior of the Sulpicians, would be chosen as Promoters, but Dr. England objected that the Bishops should first decide by a majority vote whether there should be one or two Promoters, and that the person or persons occupying this

---

[22]Cf. *Concilia Provincialia Baltimori habita etc.*, pp. 94-99. Of the twenty priests who were officials, six became bishops later—Eccleston, Chanche, Byrne, Odin, Hughes, and Bruté.

office be elected by the bishops. Dr. Whitfield opposed this, declaring that it was his right to make the appointment if he wished, and warned Dr. England that he was not the Archbishop of Baltimore. Bishops Dubois and Kenrick agreed with Dr. England, believing that the election of the Promoters would insure a more prudent choice. The racial element present, while not a serious factor in the discussions, was almost equally divided between the French and the others (Irish, American, German, Italian). Dr. Kenrick considered that the manner of nomination or election would have been a trifling matter, except for the fact that it made clear to all those present the attitude of Dr. Whitfield towards the Bishop of Charleston. The archbishop's action all through the Council was a dominating one, and Kenrick tells the Cardinal-Prefect on November 7, 1833, that the entire proceeding quite broke the Charleston prelate's spirits—"*acrior illa agendi ratio, dominationem sapiens, episcopi Carolopolitani fregisset animos.*"

Dr. Whitfield's attitude had awakened in Bishop England's mind the advisability of his resigning his See, and Kenrick, as we have seen, wrote in haste, lest the Holy See should agree to his resignation, since Dr. England's translation to another See would be deeply lamented by all who were devoted to the American Church.[23]

For several months Dr. England kept silent on the treatment accorded him by the Archbishop and on December 16, 1833, wrote to Paul Cullen as follows:

> At the Council a very general prejudice existed against me for what I had done in Rome in preventing the grasp that was made by a private arrangement respecting Illinois and part of the North-West, and an opposition was privately organized in which Purcell was drawn to unite with the others and thus make a majority, leaving me, Kenrick, Rese and Portier; sometimes we had Dubois, but seldom, and then the others were equal.
>
> The great fear was that I sought to get some way into the Archbishopric, and wanted in the meantime to use my legatine commission to sustain me. However, much of what would have been greatly injudicious was prevented. The skirt of Illinois given to St. Louis is not one fourth of what it was originally sought to obtain. I at once voted for the Coadjutor to the Archbishop, *though aware from expressions of Doctor Whitfield that*

[23]Prop. Arch., *Scritt. rifer., Amer. Cent.*, vol. 11.

it was but the expression of a plan laid by Doctor Maréchal before his death, to prevent the possibility of my being numbered among his successors.

The vote adding Virginia to Baltimore is a most injurious one, though when I saw it useless to oppose, I, to try and conciliate, concurred in it, though the State is thereby sacrificed to what was the only ground urged, viz. the "honor" of Baltimore, not the benefit of Virginia. The Archbishop has merely seen one or two places in it, and it is ten times better fitted for a Diocess than Indiana even with all Illinois; far more so than Alabama and Florida.

The newly erected See of Vincennes has Bruté, who is one of the best of men, but though my kindest friend, I did my best to keep him out for his own sake and that of the Diocess. But I am left in a small minority. Rese and Kenrick saw so plainly that a party had been formed against anything that I would introduce, that they and I concluded it was better I should do nothing at this time. However, I sacrificed my feelings and kept charity and affection, and we parted in friendship. But no effort was made to evade the meeting in April, 1837.

A day later he added:

I arrived in New York on the 21st of September, came without delay to Charleston, found everything in my Diocess in the most perfect order, made a visitation of the middle stations of this State and of part of North Carolina, then proceeded through Virginia to Baltimore, where the Council was held on the 20th of October, and found myself in a minority with Rese and Kenrick, generally Portier, and sometimes Dubois. However, we were able greatly to circumscribe the effort of St. Louis to grasp what Jeanjean had been endeavoring to get for him. Virginia is sought for by Baltimore for honor, not for utility. The Archbishop knows less of the State than I do. I have travelled through it much more than he has. I saw it was a lost cause and voted in this instance with the majority for conciliation, though I stated my reason against the vote, but the hope was vain. It appeared to be fixed that whatever I should introduce should be negatived. I kept quiet, and no breach of charity was effected, no unkind feeling produced. Bruté was named for Vincennes quite against my judgment. And the Archbishop said enough to show me that the Coadjutorship of Baltimore had been fixed by Doctor Maréchal not only in the case of the present incumbent, but in that now sought by Dr. Eccleston, to prevent the chance of my being found upon the list of his successors. As soon as the proposition was made

I instantly sustained it, to show that on my part there was no wish of interference.[24]

The eleven decrees of the Council deal with the following subjects: the new See of Vincennes; the suppression of the vacant See of Richmond; the geographical limits of the American Sees; the mode of nominating to vacant bishoprics in the future; the establishment of Jesuit missions among the Indians; the Liberian Mission for the negroes; the new Ritual; the foundation of Seminaries in each diocese; the censorship of text-books used in Catholic schools and colleges; the revocation of extra-diocesan faculties; and the convocation of the Third Provincial Council, which was to take place the third Sunday after Easter, in 1837. Of these the most important were: the Indian missions, the Liberian Mission, and the new method of selecting bishops for vacant Sees.

While in Rome (May, 1833), Dr. England submitted to the Holy See two memorials; one regarding the spiritual care of the Catholic Indians in the United States, and the other the establishment of a Catholic Mission in the new Negro Republic of Liberia. These two questions were discussed during the Council with the result, as we shall see, that Dr. England's advice was ignored and the problem practically left unsettled.

I was sorry [wrote Paul Cullen to Dr. Kenrick on February 1, 1834], to hear of the reception which Dr. England met with from his Brethren in America. Whilst here all his thoughts and all his exertions were directed towards the promotion of religion and the advancement of the interests of the American Church . . . I hope you will encourage him not to yield under the weight of affliction and not to think of resigning the charge of the flock which the Lord committed to his care. I communicated the part of your letter which regarded Dr. England to the Pope. He was very sorry to hear of the contradictions which his Lordship has met with and he could not conceive why the other prelates should be displeased with his projects and proposals here in Rome, as His Holiness considered them very reasonable and calculated to promote the interests of religion; and besides he was perfectly aware of the rectitude of intention that Dr. England displayed on every occasion.[25]

On January 27, 1834, Propaganda in a general session discussed

[24]Irish College *Portfolio,* pp. 100-101.
[25]BCA—Case 28—R8.

the names sent in by the prelates of the Council (October 26, 1833) for the three Sees:

Coadjutor to Baltimore: Eccleston, Deluol, Chanche. Diocese of New Orleans: Jeanjean, Dubuisson, Damphoux. Diocese of Vincennes: Bruté, Blanc, Loras.

Jeanjean was decided upon for New Orleans, and Eccleston for Baltimore. The erection of the See of Vincennes was again deferred.

Regarding the adoption of a definite mode of filling vacant sees in the United States, the Sacred Congregation at its meeting on March 18, 1834, decided upon the following complicated system. When a See became vacant, all the bishops of the Province should be asked for the names of worthy candidates. Since this could be done best in a Provincial Council, the selection should be deferred until the bishops' assembly, providing this took place within three months. If no Council was to be held within that time, every bishop should have in his possession two copies of a letter, each signed and sealed, containing at least three names of priests worthy in his estimation of the episcopal office. This letter should be so addressed that, upon his death, the Vicar-General will send one of these copies to the archbishop, and the other to the nearest or the oldest bishop in the Province. After receiving this copy, this nearest or oldest bishop should send it to the archbishop with whatever remarks he deems necessary. The archbishop was then at liberty to discuss the candidates with all his suffragans, and might suggest other names, in case the three in the dead prelate's letter seemed to him unsuited. All the suffragans should then write to the Sacred Congregation, giving their opinion on the candidates. In case the archbishop be dead, the senior suffragan was to be responsible in the matter. Should a bishop die without leaving this letter, the Vicar-General of the diocese would then notify the nearest bishop or the oldest suffragan who would inform the archbishop. In this case the archbishop was to designate three candidates and correspond with his suffragans on their suitability. Where a bishop desired to have a coadjutor, he should send the names of three priests to the archbishop, and the suffragans would petition the Holy See to that effect, but the archbishop and the other suffragans were to write

to the Sacred Congregation their views in the matter. In recommending priests to the Holy See for the office of bishop, the terms *nominatio, electio, postulatio,* should be avoided, the term *commendatio* alone being canonical.[26]

At this same general meeting of the Cardinals of Propaganda the *Acta et Decreta* of the Council were thoroughly studied and decisions given on each decree. There is a significant passage in Dr. Whitfield's letter to the Holy Father, after the Council closed, dated November 2, 1834, in which he says (it is preferable to keep to the original text): "*Ut Sanctitas Vestra Rev. Dom. Samuelem Eccleston, meum coadjutorem designare dignetur, ut nihil amplius desiderare videatur. Attamen pace Sanctitatis Vestrae verbum addam, nimirum, dum illmus. ac Revnus. Praedecessor meus, Rev. Maréchal adhuc vitam ageret, sed morti proximus, desiderium suum aperuit, scilicet quod si archiepiscopalem dignitatem obtinerem, vel Rev. M. Fr. Wheeler, (nunc defunctum) vel supradictum Rev. Samuelem Eccleston, tempore opportuno, Sanctitati Vestrae meum Coadjutorem designandum praesentarem.*"[27]

On April 12, the brief was dispatched creating the See of Vincennes and appointing Father Bruté its first bishop; and on May 17, Propaganda informed Dr. Whitfield of its approbation of the Council's decrees.[28] On October 31, 1834, a joint letter was sent from St. Louis by Bishops Flaget, Rosati, Purcell and Bruté to the Cardinal-Prefect, stating that from letters which had reached them from Bishop England, it was evident that the Charleston prelate was seriously thinking of resigning his See. They wrote to secure the influence of the Holy See to prevent such a calamity to the American Church. Dr. England had given glory to the Catholic Church and to its doctrines not only in his own diocese but through all the land, where he was admired and respected for his eloquence, his learning, and his devotion to the cause of truth. Moreover these prelates asked in all candor that some other means be used by the Holy See to arrange affairs in Haiti than by depriving the

---

[26]Prop. Arch., *Lettere,* vol. 315, fol. 350 (printed in the *Concilia Provincialia Balt. habita etc.,* pp. 117-120). This system remained in vogue until the Seventh Provincial Council of Baltimore in 1849.

[27]*Ibid.,* fol. 30.

[28]*Ibid.,* fol. 241, 282.

Church in America of this "splendid ornament, inspired preacher, and invincible defender" of the Catholic Faith. The Church was being attacked as never before in the history of the United States, and Dr. England's voice and pen were indispensable. A few weeks later (October 24), Dr. Conwell in one of his interminable letters to Cardinal Pedicini, expressed his fear that there might be some truth in the "*magnus clamor*" which existed in Baltimore and in Philadelphia that Dr. England would be appointed Whitfield's successor.

Dr. Purcell had already written (October 9) to Bishop England, who was then in Rome:

> Having been too free in protesting on a former occasion against your removal by the Holy Father from the United States, I must assure you of the shuddering which the idea of such a transfer brings over me at this hour. If you will have my opinion of the respected and learned men you name, providing for a contingency which, I again say, I hope will never arrive, I agree to any of them and in any order you prefer. I expected, if you have nothing better in petto for him, to see our friend, John Power of New York, among the men according to your own heart. I fear his merits are not sufficiently appreciated where he is.[29]

It is clear from the documentary evidence of this time that Dr. England had practically decided to leave the United States for good. The prelates of the Second Provincial Council realized that he had been unfairly dealt with by the archbishop and by his advisers. That Dr. England had deeply offended the latter must be admitted. He was directly responsible for Rome's command to Dr. Whitfield to convoke the Provincial Council, and in more than one of his public addresses in the Conventions of his diocese he had charged the Seminary of St. Mary in Baltimore with incapacity, inefficiency and un-American ways and customs. In one sense he received only what he might have expected in the Council; for he attacked well-entrenched interests in the cradle of the American hierarchy.

During his second visit to Europe (April-December, 1834), rumors multiplied about his future. At one moment he was accepting a See in Ireland; at another he was about to be made a Car-

[29]Irish College *Portfolio*, p. 138.

dinal; and his high post as Assistant at the Papal Throne and Papal Delegate to Haiti brought him out prominently in international ecclesiastical affairs. He had at this time, as at all epochs in his life, few intimate friends. Paul Cullen, as we shall see, he cherished as a brother, only to be disappointed in the apostolic zeal of Ireland's future Cardinal. In a letter dated May 18, 1834, Cullen wrote to Dr. Kenrick:

> I was sorry to hear that Dr. England perseveres in his intention of abandoning his diocess, for it will be difficult to find the person to supply his place. It is particularly unfortunate that his colleagues have not greater confidence in him, and that through fear of being carried too far by his influence, they should reject projects which would evidently tend to the advantage of religion. I do not think that the Pope will allow him to resign, as His Holiness is perfectly convinced of the purity of his intentions and is well acquainted with his zeal and his talents. He was also very much displeased at hearing of the way the Archbishop treated Dr. England in the Council.[30]

It was in this frame of mind, namely, that his influence in America was ended owing to the strong oppositions he encountered, that Bishop England penned for the Holy See (probably in May, 1834) a *relazione* concerning church affairs in the United States. Cardinal Weld analyzed the document Dr. England prepared and then presented the principal *punti* to Propaganda. Dr. England was convinced that the progress of the Faith in America was being hindered by the administrative methods of the Baltimore group. Among the principal impediments to the advance of the Church, Weld enumerated the following:

1. The lack of a sufficient clergy.
2. The evil conduct of some priests who had come from Europe not so much out of zeal as by necessity, and were accepted by our prelates because of the need of missionaries.
3. The ignorance of so many priests in America of the language, customs and laws of the United States; so much so that the people believe our Church is more a foreign institution in the land than a part of the American Republic.
4. The lack of theological training in many other priests.

[30]BCA—Case 28—R3.

5. The unfortunate efforts made by others of the clergy to accentuate in the Catholic Church here an affinity to certain foreign ecclesiastical institutions. The Americans are not suspicious of our spiritual dependence upon the Holy See; that they understand, knowing it to be essential to the organization of our Church; but their suspicions and jealousy are easily aroused, if that dependence seems to be given to other foreign centers. Such dependence involves direction and overseership from foreigners.
6. The absolute lack of any co-operation or understanding between the American bishops. Dr. England had grave reason to believe that the Philadelphia schism would still be in full swing, had it not been checked by the Council of 1829.
7. Although the successors of John Carroll in the archiepiscopal See of Baltimore have been excellent men, nevertheless the opinion is quite general that the Holy See had not selected prelates of a very high order for that important post. Moreover, one grave evil is the perdurance of private nominations to American Sees.
8. The nomination to American Sees is a much more important affair than in any other part of the Church. Owing to the extraordinary powers and authority of the bishops here, great care must be taken in their selection.
9. The American people are intelligent, well educated, and keen observers, and personal qualifications for any office rank high in their estimation of that office itself. To send among them prelates whose personal deficiencies are noticeable to all, will only ruin respect for the episcopal office itself.
10. The Americans are extremely patriotic; and are not inclined to be hospitable to foreigners who may be placed over them. Some of the priests in the United States not not only do not become citizens but also declare their preference for foreign institutional methods. Nothing convinces the American people more quickly of the alleged incompatibility of Catholicism with the American Republic.
11. Another grave cause of disorder is the absence of any legislation in the American Church for the protection of the priests. Having only delegated jurisdiction in their parishes *ad nutum episcopi,* they are at the mercy of a bishop's whims and fancies, and have no means of appeal from unjust censures or penal inflictions.
12. The American people are a law-abiding people, and the

laws are respected so long as the voice of the people is had in its making. They will not obey whimsical legislation and to a certain extent, in the absence of Provincial Councils, ecclesiastical legislation is of that kind.

13. The lack of any clear and defined status in the management of church property.

From internal evidence it would appear that this document antedates the holding of the Second Provincial Council, although it bears as the year of its presentation to Propaganda, 1834, and it may have been used in the deliberations at Rome over the *Acta et Decreta* of that Council.

A year after the Council, on October 19, 1834, Archbishop Whitfield passed away in the sixty-fourth year of his age, and the seventh of his episcopate. A month before his death (September 14), Dr. Eccleston was consecrated Coadjutor-Archbishop of Baltimore. The fifth Archbishop of Baltimore was born of English parents, a few miles from Chestertown, on the Eastern Shore of Maryland, on June 23, 1801. He was in his thirty-third year at the time of his consecration. The next three Provincial Councils (1837, 1840, 1843) were held under his direction.

The *Pastoral Letter* issued on October 27, 1833, written by Bishop England and signed by the ten prelates of the Council, reflects the serious problems facing the discipline and the peace of the Church in the United States. The bishops deplored generally the want of priests for the ever-increasing body of the faithful, and the lack of churches. They exhorted all who were without priestly ministration to gather together on Sundays and holydays of obligation for prayer and catechetical instruction. They appealed to their flocks not to grow discouraged in the face of the threatening attitude of so many Protestants throughout the country, but to show in all their words and actions an affectionate attachment to their country, and to go forward with confidence that the foundations of American life, liberty, equality, and religious toleration, would not be overthrown by fanatics.

CHAPTER XXVII

The Apostolic Delegation to Haiti

(1833-1837)

The Apostolic Delegation to the Republic of Haiti was Dr. England's outstanding failure. He was the first bishop of the United States to be sent by the Holy See upon a diplomatic mission of such importance. The post itself was an extraordinary one from the ecclesiastical point of view: for attached to his legatine powers was that of administrator of the Archdiocese of Santo Domingo, one of the oldest in Spanish America. Some three hundred years before Dr. England's appointment, this first ecclesiastical Province in the New World had been created in the island of Hispaniola. By the Brief *Illius fulciti* (November 5, 1504), Pope Julius II created the Province of Hispaniola with dioceses at Hyaguata, Magua, and Bayuna. Owing to a conflict with the Spanish Crown, these dioceses were suppressed shortly afterwards; and in 1511, by the *Pontifex Romanus*, the same Pope created three new Sees as suffragans to the Archdiocese of Seville. Two of these, Santo Domingo and Concepcion de la Vega, were in the island of Hispaniola, or Santo Domingo, as it began to be called after 1508.[1]

On February 12, 1545, by the Brief *Super Universas*, Pope Paul III raised the See of Santo Domingo to the rank of an archdiocese. Up to the year 1697, the entire island of Hispaniola was a Spanish possession. The Treaty of Ryswick (1697) ceded the western part of the island, the "high ground" or Haiti, to France. The French section entered upon an era of prosperity and Haiti soon ranked as the richest colony in the West Indies. The country came to be known as the paradise of the West Indies, and the wealth of the planters became proverbial. The grave defect was that this prosperity was built on slavery. During the colonial period of American commerce, trade was brisk between Haiti and the ports of Florida, Georgia,

[1]This date marks the completion of the great Church of St. Nicholas in Santo Domingo City. A cathedral was also begun there in 1514 and was completed about 1540. Both these edifices are still in a fair state of preservation.

and the Carolinas, and a regular passenger traffic between New York and Port au Prince was established. The journey in the sailing vessels from New York to Haiti usually took fifteen days. In 1754, the population of Haiti is estimated as numbering 14,000 whites, 4,000 free mulattoes, and 172,000 negro slaves.

Prosperity in the eastern or Spanish part of the island (Santo Domingo) sank as rapidly as Haiti advanced, owing to maladministration by Spanish colonial officials. In 1730, San Domingo held but 6,000 inhabitants, many of whom were living in poverty. The opening of port facilities in 1740 inaugurated a new era of prosperity in Santo Domingo, and both the French and Spanish parts of the island were enjoying a fair degree of commercial success, when the principles of the French Revolution reached the island and there began a series of uprisings and civil wars, rebellions and massacres which have few equals in savagery in the history of the New World.

The first successful revolution occurred under Toussaint l'Ouverture (1791-1801), who made himself master of the whole island. The exodus of those whites who had escaped death began in 1791 and continued for a number of years until Napoleon's brother-in-law, General Le Clerc, subdued the island. Under the Emperor James I (Jean Jacques Dessalines), the negroes took advantage of the weakness of France and set up a Black Republic. Dessalines ordered the extermination of all the whites who remained, and, with the exception of some unworthy priests from France and Corsica, the Catholic clergy left the island.

Ecclesiastically the entire island constituted a single diocese, the Archdiocese of Santo Domingo, over which thirty-seven archbishops had ruled from 1545 to 1789, when Peter Valera, the last incumbent, fled before the revolution to Cuba. In some of the cities of Haiti and Santo Domingo, during these two centuries, Vicars-General were stationed subject to the Archbishop of Santo Domingo. In this way a system of ecclesiastical government existed which guaranteed peace and discipline. Dominicans, Capuchins, Jesuits, and secular priests had at various epochs from 1659 to 1789 labored in the churches and missions of the island; but after the outbreak of the French Revolution the churches were abandoned and the Catholic religion practically ceased to be a factor in the spiritual life of the natives.

Various attempts were made by France, England, and Spain to reconquer the island, by fomenting war between the two sections. In Haiti, Jean Pierre Boyer secured control of the political situation in 1818, and in 1821 he began the subjugation of Santo Domingo. The following year, Boyer was proclaimed President of the Republic of Haiti, and for the next twenty-two years, in spite of various insurrections, ruled the whole island. All slaves were emancipated, and colored people were encouraged to come from the United States and settle there. Boyer had confiscated all church property and had made himself the head of spiritual affairs of the island through priests whose lives were of such a kind that Dr. England declined to describe them in his *Relazione* of 1834. Everywhere the spirit of infidelistic philosophy prevailed; and, while the natives were predominantly Catholic, the Church of Haiti was a fallen Church at the time of Bishop England's visitation.

Through refugees from Haiti and Santo Domingo after 1789, the story of this collapse of religion was well known in the United States, and especially in Catholic circles where distinguished exiles from the West Indies became prominent.[2]

The Protestant religious bodies then began sending missionaries from the United States to Haiti. Boyer, if of any religion, was a Catholic, and at the beginning of his presidency began correspondence with Rome for the purpose of bringing the long period of misrule in the ecclesiastical affairs of the Republic to an end. The condition of the Church in Haiti baffled John England's powers of description. In various parts of the island Catholic services had degenerated into a species of pagan ceremonial. Laymen set themselves up as priests and voodooism became rampant. In 1824, to add to the confusion, a large number of Calvinistic ministers were

[2]Among these was Audubon, the naturalist [cf. *Records* (ACHS), vol. XV, pp. 8-21]. Many of the refugees arrived in Philadelphia (1791-93), and their history is bound up with the Asylum Colony of Pennsylvania. Among them was Viscount de Noailles, who had been deputed by Washington to receive the sword of Cornwallis at the surrender of Yorktown (cf. *ibid.*, vol. XV, pp. 245-261, 421-433). Talleyrand visited Asylum in 1795 and Louis Phillippe was there in 1796. One of the traditions of the Colony was that it was to be a place of refuge for Marie Antoinette, should she succeed in escaping from France. Father Carles, who figures in the earliest annals of the Church in Georgia, was a member of the Asylum Colony. Cf. *San Domingo Refugees in Philadelphia* (*ibid.*, vol. XXVIII, pp. 98-125, 184-185, 212-243, 356-379; vol. XXIX, pp. 66-88, 140-152, 262-279; vol. XXX, pp. 83-91, 177-188, 227-256, 309-330).

sent to Haiti from Switzerland, and illiterate negro preachers, mostly Methodists, began to flock into the island from the United States.

Whatever may have been Boyer's attitude towards the Church, his government was frankly atheistic and pagan, and had thwarted every effort made by the Holy See from 1818 to 1833 to reorganize the Catholic hierarchy of the Republic. In 1820, although his name is not found in Gams' *Series Episcoporum*, Pierre Glory, a French priest, is said to have been consecrated Vicar-Apostolic, but apparently his residence was a short one, since no trace of his labors could be found. In 1821, Bishop Poynter of the London District wrote to President Boyer asking for permission to send out some missionaries to Haiti but was refused. That same year, the Papal Nuncio of Paris pleaded in vain with Haitian representatives who had come to France to secure the recognition of the Republic, to obtain restoration of Catholic life and discipline in the island. The Papal Nuncio in Brazil likewise approached the Haitian government (1830-1831) with the same request but was also refused, on the score that the Republic would not admit any priests or bishops to labor in the church there, unless they were of native stock. As Dr. England viewed the situation, Boyer's secret reason for opening negotiations with the Holy See on the question of hierarchial restoration was not due to his desire to see Catholic life revived, but to a realization that the long-standing enmity between the two parts of the island would sooner or later bring about a revolution against a united Haiti. He sought to use the arm of the hierarchy to support this unity; and to ensure the success of his political manœuvre he insisted that no bishop should be appointed without the consent of his government.

Some time in 1832, President Boyer wrote to Pope Gregory XVI, asking that the Holy See send a representative entrusted with requisite powers to re-establish the Catholic hierarchy of the island. From more than one point of view, it was unfortunate that Dr. England arrived in Rome at the time the Haitian situation was being discussed by Propaganda Fide. He had won the esteem of all the officials of the Sacred Congregation for his tact and prudence, his learning and his energetic spirit of apostolic zeal. When Pope Gregory asked him to accept the delegation to Haiti, Dr. England realized at once that such a post would mean the frustration of his

purpose in going to Europe, namely, the quest of financial aid for Charleston. He knew his South too well not to realize, far more keenly than the Holy Father ever could, the serious risk he ran in accepting the chairmanship of a series of official negotiations with a negro republic whose government had abolished slavery.

Looking backward, it is easy to realize that the five years he devoted to the Haitian concordat were unfavorable to the progress of the Church in his own diocese.

The choice of Dr. Clancy as his coadjutor was more than unfortunate, for Dr. England's deception in Clancy's moral character was complete. The five years which followed the failure of the Haitian negotiations before Dr. England's death (1837-1842) were years spent in repairing the forced neglect of the House of God in the Southland rather than, as they should have been, the successful completion of his unflagging zeal and devotion.

At a conference held by Propaganda Fide on February 25, 1833, in the presence of the Holy Father, John England was accredited to the Haitian Government as Apostolic Delegate Extraordinary for the resumption of official relations with the Holy See; and on March 9, the decree appointing him to this post as well as to the administratorship of the Archdiocese of Santo Domingo was issued. Dr. England was thus enabled to go to Haiti not only as the representative of the Pope but also as the highest ecclesiastical authority in the island. A few weeks later, as a mark of his personal esteem, Pope Gregory XVI made Dr. England an Assistant to the Pontifical Throne; the brief reads: "*personaggio il più distincto per singolare lode di eloquenza, per dottrina e per l'indefesso impegno, onde da molti anni tratta la causa della Chiesa Catholica in quelle vaste regioni con molto vantaggio della religione.*"

Among the problems which Dr. England intended to bring to the notice of the Holy See during this first journey he made to Rome after his consecration, was, as has been mentioned in a previous chapter, that of the Indians and Negroes in the United States. On May 20, 1833, he presented to Gregory XVI two long memorials on this problem, in which he emphasized the fact that the Indian and Negro situation was one which was not confined to a single diocese but common to the whole Church in the United States. Owing to the lack of co-operation between the American bishops, a lack

due almost entirely to the attitude of Archbishops Maréchal and Whitfield towards Provincial Councils, both the Indians and the Negroes were being woefully neglected. The drive upon the Indians had begun some time before 1833, and the United States government was determined to place all the Indians then in the East in reservations beyond the Mississippi. Protestant ministers saw a good opportunity financially in the reservations, and the Church was practically ignored, even among those tribes which were known to be entirely Catholic. With the Negro slaves of the United States the situation was almost as bad. State laws prevented their education, and hindrances of all kinds kept the Catholic clergy from taking an active part in the work of evangelizing the colored portion of the population. The Negro problem was particularly pressing in the Diocese of Charleston; but Dr. England knew by sad experience that the animus against his projects was so strong in the ecclesiastical life of Baltimore, that he feared to take any initiative in the matter, lest the archbishop and those who held to his attitude, would cripple what little had been done out of opposition to him. Dr. England had hoped that the Council of 1829 would take cognizance of the work of the "American Society for the Colonization of the Free People of Color of the United States," in establishing the State of Liberia. In Dr. England's day the Abolition movement was pronouncedly Protestant and anti-Catholic, and he cited for the Holy Father several paragraphs from one of the Society's latest pamphlets, in which the Holy See and the Church were proclaimed as abettors of slavery. He believed that the Pope should insist upon the holding of a Provincial Council in Baltimore as soon as possible in order to meet the situation and, it has been seen, advised the Holy See that the Indians and Negroes be placed under bishops specially devoted to their spiritual welfare.

There was in Rome at this time a priest of New Orleans, Father Auguste Jeanjean, who had been Bishop Rosati's theologian at the Council of 1829, and who had come to Rome (1833) to transact business for Bishop De Neckere. Propaganda suggested Jeanjean as Dr. England's secretary for the Haitian legation, and the New Orleans priest accepted the post. With him Dr. England spoke openly and frankly about the condition of the Indians and Negroes, and Jeanjean led the bishop to believe that he was thoroughly in sym-

pathy with his plans. Some of these plans were based upon what Dr. England believed to be neglect by the Society of Jesus in the Indian Missions of Missouri and Louisiana. These plans and criticisms Jeanjean carried to the General of the Jesuits; and, after making Dr. England known to the head of the Society as inimical to its interests, he left Rome, and Dr. England was not to see him again until he met him at the Second Provincial Council in Baltimore (October, 1833). Here, Jeanjean, who was theologian for the Diocese of New Orleans, revealed all the private conversations of Dr. England with the Roman officials; and the result was, as Bishop Kenrick of Philadelphia confessed in a letter to Paul Cullen, one of the bitterest experiences John England ever had. The Council confided the Indians and the Negroes and especially the Liberian Mission to the Jesuits. This was virtually to postpone action on one of the most pressing questions troubling the American Church.

It was undoubtedly the strong interest shown by Bishop England in the welfare of the Negro population of the United States which prompted Propaganda officials to suggest his name to the Holy See for the difficult and delicate problem of church organization in Haiti.

No news had reached the Holy See for some years from Archbishop Peter Valera, of Santo Domingo, who was then believed to be in exile in Cuba. On May 21, 1833, Propaganda wrote to this prelate informing him of Dr. England's legatine powers and requesting Valera to co-operate with the Bishop of Charleston in reorganizing the Church in Haiti. The only news which the Holy See had of Haiti came from a letter written to Cardinal Fesch by Father Salgado, of Port au Prince, who signed himself Vicar-General for Haiti. A copy of this letter was given to Dr. England, and it was hoped that Salgado would support him in the negotiations with President Boyer. Dr. England was deceived in Salgado, for, while outwardly living according to the canons of priestly perfection, it was only after the first series of the negotiations was finished, that he learned that Salgado was unworthy of his priestly calling and a tool in Boyer's hands.

Early in June, 1833, Dr. England started homeward, and after completing arrangements for the collections he had begun in Ireland for Charleston, he sailed from Havre on August 17. Before

leaving he sent Paul Cullen a long account of the injury done to his plans for his diocese owing to Propaganda's urgent request that he leave at once for Haiti. "There is a line of Packets", he writes, "from New York to Port-au-Prince in Haiti, and I shall probably take an early one of these soon after my arrival. But what am I to do for a Secretary? this good man (Jeanjean) who is paid for his expenses, but is not to be found when wanted for business! Should I meet him in America, I shall ask him to come, though I anticipate a refusal from some expressions he used to me in Rome, to the effect that he should first go to St. Louis to see Dr. Rosati. But as I have undertaken the task, I go, if necessary, alone."

After attending the Second Provincial Council, Dr. England devoted November and December to diocesan affairs, and on December 14, 1833, wrote to Cardinal Pedicini that he was at last free to leave for Haiti. A ship sailing direct from Charleston to Santo Domingo was not available, so he was going first to Guadeloupe, thence to St. Thomas, and from that island to Port au Prince. He expected to be in the Haitian capital by the end of January, 1834. Owing to the death of Bishop De Neckere as well as to Jeanjean's open opposition to him in the Council, Dr. England did not ask the New Orleans priest to accompany him. He chose as his Secretary Rev. Timothy Bermingham, of Charleston, who spoke French well, and who was trustworthy. The United States Government afforded him as much help as was possible in the unsettled state of diplomatic relations between Washington and Port au Prince. Jeanjean's action towards Dr. England is discussed in a letter from the latter to Paul Cullen, dated Charleston, December 17, 1833:

> Jeanjean is proposed for New Orleans and of course will be appointed. He was forced at the Council by me to acknowledge that I candidly told him all that I did, and shewed him everything that I wrote, at Rome; whilst he concealed from me important steps that he took, and serious plans that he formed, in direct contravention of the very propositions that I made; and he was driven to acknowledge that he did this knowingly whilst he saw me writing, and was brought by me to the consultations where the Propaganda sought for information. He was then in correspondence with Bishops of this country, who, in the Council where he was not, produced measures and plans in direct opposition to those that I had recommended; and when I stated that in Rome mine was known

and this was new I was astonished to find that they asserted that Mr. Jeanjean had arranged it all; and when I examined him openly in the congregation, before I gave him and his correspondents an opportunity of convening, I got the proofs from himself. I have been greatly misrepresented to the Jesuits in Rome, I have reason to think, to the General. I had no notion of the extent of the work of the little man who went to Rome to "do nothing" and got $800 for this "nothing". Dr. Rosati acknowledged to me that he sent him and gave him a certificate to that effect. Mr. Odin is now gone over also, I suppose to "do nothing". I believe he is a good man, but for my part I am now and forever distrustful of this sort of good man. I wish you would tell Monsignor Mai, for I respect him as honest and honourable, as well as Cardinal Weld what I have stated here. I have no objection to your showing the letter to his Eminence.

Though I could never trust Jeanjean after the exposition at Baltimore, yet, I would have taken him to Haiti, as I thought he would be the most useful. But the Administrator of New Orleans objected, as Jeanjean was made by Dr. de Neckere's will the manager of all his temporalities, and his presence was therefore required in New Orleans. Besides I knew that he would be Bishop of that See, and therefore I stated my fears that he could not accompany me as early as was necessary, especially as the Holy Father and the Sacred Congregation desired that no time should be lost. Jeanjean was urging me to defer my departure until after he should have an opportunity of making his arrangements at New Orleans. This I could not consent to, so that unless he would accompany me in this month I should select another. He said he could not. I therefore take one of my own priests, Rev. T. Bermingham, who speaks French, and one of the lay sacristans who speaks Creole. But this is a serious inconvenience to my Diocess.[3]

After a voyage of sixteen days aboard the *Galathee* from Charleston, Dr. England reached the island of Guadeloupe on January 3, 1834. As soon as he arrived he found a schooner preparing to go to St. Thomas, from which port constant sailings were to be had for Haiti. From Guadeloupe to St. Thomas was a two days' sail, and from St. Thomas to Port au Prince about the same. Dr. England wrote to Paul Cullen the evening he landed at Guadeloupe:

In a former letter I informed you of my intention to bring a priest of my own diocese in place of Jeanjean, who, I sup-

[3]Irish College *Portfolio*, pp. 188-190.

pose will be Bishop of New Orleans, and who could not come with me at as early a period as I wished to come, as he was administrator of the will of Bishop De Neckere. I have since reflected upon what has occurred, and from the developments at the Council as well as those in Rome, I have lost all confidence in him and in others whom I considered to be men of sincerity and candour. I should have been very unhappy with him. And I have reason to know that he made unpleasant impressions respecting me upon the Jesuits, I believe the General in Rome, and probably upon Castracane and others at the Propaganda; hence it might be necessary to find whether he has or not, so as to correct them if possible. The missions amongst the Indians are recommended to be given to the Jesuits. All this was privately arranged by him in Rome, whilst he knew that I was writing upon the subject and arranging it, that he had concealed from me the conversations he had with the General of the Jesuits upon the subject and the arrangements he was making with Doctor Rosati (*sic*). This is an unpleasant topic, but it is connected with another equally unpleasant, which is, that the good folk who have so long shut out the Irish from their proper place in the American Church, have now French and Americans, Sulpicians and Jesuits united, and are likely to continue their operations with more powerful effect. All the acts of the last Council were based upon this principle. Kenrick and Rese saw it as clearly as I did. Enough of this.

The Archbishop of San Domingo died, I understand, some months since of, I think, cholera. From every account I can get the clergy of Haiti are in a most disorderly state, and very little prospect of my mission being successful. I should not wonder however, if the persons who before withdrew from undertaking what I go upon, should represent at Rome that there exist wonderful facilities. When some years ago they spoke to me upon the subject and thought of undertaking it, the difficulties were described in very glowing terms; but last October in Baltimore, I was told by the same mouth that there could be no question of my success. God alone can tell. I shall do what I can, but the difficulties rise before me to a very formidable height. Tell the Holy Father that I do look for more from his prayers and zeal than from any prudence or exertion of my own. I shall do my best.

The negroes in Martinique have lately been in a state of insurrection, but are subdued, and several hanged and shot. I know not how far this may influence the affairs of San Domingo. Besides, the Government has failed in making its pay-

ments to France according to the stipulation, when their indolence was recognized, and thus it is questionable what part France will take for its recovery. The Island of Haiti has deteriorated so much from the sloth of its inhabitants that most of the ancient plantations are gone to ruin.[4]

In a letter to the *Miscellany* (January 10, 1834), Bishop England gives some interesting details of the state of religion in the island of St. Thomas. Though the people were mostly Danish Lutherans, they received Dr. England with every mark of courtesy, and the principal citizens of Point-à-Pitre and Basse-Terre assisted him financially in procuring a Swedish schooner. "I believe", he writes, "that I am the first bishop ever in the island, and the concourse who attended on Sunday to witness the celebration of a Pontifical High Mass, was immense." He met several Irish priests who were pastors of churches in the island and was particularly edified by the fact that the Chamber of Deputies of the island had assisted at a Mass of the Holy Ghost before beginning their sessions for the year. After a stormy and unpleasant voyage he reached Port au Prince on Sunday, January 19. He was anxious to land in time to say Mass, and, not being certain of the character of his reception, he came on shore without announcing his identity; but, after showing his passports, he was immediately treated with deference. In fact, he himself says, that he was shown much more consideration than he received at the Customs House in Rome when he was there "last Christmas Day twelve month."

He went immediately to the Presbytery, where he met the Vicar-General, Father Salgado, who was returning from Mass. He introduced himself and said he wanted to say Mass. Salgado asked his blessing, and then went to have things prepared. While he was saying Mass, the Vicar hastened to inform the President of his arrival, and later when he returned to the presbytery, an orderly arrived, saying that orders had been given to the Collector of the Port, to have all his luggage landed immediately, and that it should be sent to Dr. England without being opened or examined. The next day, a carriage, escorted by a pair of dragoons, drew up in front of the house to take him and the Vicar to the President. It was suggested that he wear his soutane and rochet, but he declined, say-

[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 192-193.

ing that he used them only when waiting upon the Pope, or officiating in church. Instead he wore what was used at presentations in the Courts of Vienna and Naples, namely, a coat and silk cloak and a pectoral cross. When he arrived at the President's house, Boyer's nephew opened the door of the carriage for him. At the head of the stairs, General Inginac, the Secretary-General, received him in full uniform, surrounded by his staff.

On January 21, 1834, Dr. England wrote a short letter to Paul Cullen, describing his reception in Haiti:

> I write in haste to be ready for a vessel which is just leaving this for New York. Monsignor Mai will have no difficulty in shewing you the letter which I write officially to the Propaganda. I shall not therefore repeat its contents. Say to the Holy Father that no man ever had more the gratitude and affection of another than he has of President Boyer. I seldom witnessed a more affecting scene than my introduction. After the formality was over he took me aside to speak in confidence. We opened our hearts to each other, for I saw that he was honest, and though forced by circumstances to do many acts which in truth were violations of all ecclesiastical discipline, yet there was scarcely room for him to act otherwise. If all here were like him my mission would have a speedy and happy result. But the Constitution is bad, the laws are worse, and the changes absolutely essential are not easily made and require the concurrence of many; and of these many few possess the heart and principles of the President. However, God will do His own work. The people are well disposed but want cultivation. The clergy have been depraved, and Boyer's usurpations were in fact the only mode by which they could be restrained; and when a proper ecclesiastical mode is established the usurpation will cease. My duty is neither light nor easy, but I shall be amply repaid if my labours tend to second the efforts of the Holy Father whom the Holy Ghost must have inspired, according to the declaration of Boyer and of the Vicar, Salgado, a mulatto priest from the Spanish main, who has done much good here. It is a most fortunate circumstance that Jeanjean did not accompany me. I have been assured by the highest authority that, if he was with me, I never could have the confidence that is manifestly reposed in me. They distrust Frenchmen, and Boyer told me that if I

knew the hundredth part of what occurred I would not blame them for their distrust.[5]

Before leaving Rome, Dr. England had been furnished by Propaganda Fide with detailed instructions for his mission in Haiti. The double purpose he was asked to keep in mind was to provide at once for the urgent needs of the abandoned faithful and to procure the restoration of ecclesiastical jurisdiction in the island. The only restriction placed upon him was not to sign any convention or concordat with the Haitian government without having first obtained its approval by the Holy See. The basis of an acceptable concordat was the abrogation of all laws contrary to Christian principles. The Holy See wished to see a native clergy and a native hierarchy in Haiti, but it reserved to itself the right to select the incumbents of the present and future Haitian Sees. Propaganda would be willing to educate native sons of Haiti for the priesthood, until the island had its own Seminary. Meanwhile, owing to the fact that Haiti had become a refuge for French and Spanish priests of unworthy lives, these would have to be dismissed from the churches in which the Haitian Government had placed them.

It was with these instructions in mind that Dr. England presented himself to Boyer. The story of his first interview is best told in his own words to Paul Cullen (January 23):

> The whole thing was admirably well done, though I saw myself surrounded by faces of every colour. We advanced to the audience chamber, a very fine room, in which Boyer stood alone in a suit of full rich general's uniform of blue and gold. He seemed impatient to receive me, advanced nearly to the door, and whilst I was making my best bow he addressed me, expressing joy at beholding under his roof an envoy from His Holiness. Somehow or other, my French came out better and more flippantly than usual. I expressed not badly the following sentiments: My regret that my imperfect mode of speaking the French language prevented my expressing as I could wish the sentiments which the Holy Father would convey through so unworthy a representative. Otherwise I would tell His Excellency of the special interest felt by His Holiness in the prosperity of the Haitian Republic, not merely as regarded its religious concerns, but also the temporal interests of an interesting portion of the human family, whom, though separated

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 104. The letter to Boyer from Pope Gregory XVI is printed in the *Cath. Misc.*, vol. XIII, p. 318.

from him by many a mountain and by many a wave, he looked upon as dear children whom he embraced with tender affection. The Holy Father regretted that hitherto the efforts made for the establishment of religion in the Republic had met several obstacles and been without success. But the Head of the Church cherished the hope that if the Haitian Government united its efforts with those of the Holy See and both were seconded by the zeal of the citizens, there would follow from this union of exertion the happiest results. That probably under the blessing of God, the best foundation on which those hopes might rest would be the creation, as soon as possible, of an enlightened and virtuous native clergy and the regulation of discipline for the Haitian church upon the best principles of simple Catholic administration, which would at the same time be not only compatible with the institutions and interests of the Republic, but calculated to raise its character among the Catholic nations. I added that the Holy Father entertained a high opinion of the zeal for religion manifested by President Boyer, for his private character, (which I find to be excellent) as well as for his public services, that the report received of those qualities secured to him the affectionate esteem of the Holy See. I then presented the Brief, which he received with respect and warmth. Boyer is a man of good appearance, active, intelligent, courageous and honourable. He stood more erect and his eyes sparkled when I spoke, he seemed eager to interrupt me, but I went on. Never did I witness more sincere and ardent enthusiasm than in the burning words that followed. The rapturous gratitude to Gregory XVI, the thanks to myself and the assurances of his determination to do his utmost to meet the wishes of the Holy Father, his attachment to the Christian, with emphasis he said, the *Catholic, his own Catholic Religion, that of the holy Roman See* whose legate he was proud to see before him. Inginac and Salgado were the only witnesses of the scene. He then told me that he saw that I spoke my heart, that in treating with me, there should be no political caution and begged of me to retire with him.

We went into a splendidly furnished large saloon where he led me to a sofa and wanted to place me on his right, this I peremptorily refused. "We are alone", said he. "Have you seen our correspondence with Rome?" "Yes". "Then you understand our case. Will you direct us. Will you tell us what to do?" "There are many difficulties", said I, "to be removed. I attribute many of the mistakes that have been made to the difficulty of your circumstances. I shall treat you with the frankness of a brother if you permit me." Taking my

hand he repeated with energy: "As a brother so let it be." "I shall appoint commissioners to treat with you, but see me when you please and say openly what you think and I shall do the same." We then returned, he presented his family to me, and after a little conversation I was escorted home. Next morning an officer came to inform me that he had orders from the President of Haiti to furnish my apartments at the Presbytery in the best manner and to provide in every way for my wants at the public expense, and begged that I would give orders freely and unhesitatingly. General Inginac called on me in the afternoon to compliment me on my arrival, to inform me that he and the youngest senator had been appointed to treat with me on ecclesiastical affairs, and to request that I would have no reserve, pledging his honour that they would act openly, honourably and candidly with me, and be happy to try and meet my views, that such was the wish of the President, that the sequel would prove that they would be worthy of my confidence. I said I should be ready to begin when they pleased. He said the beginning of next week. He then said that they had already to complain of me, that I landed without affording the Haitians an opportunity of exhibiting their respect for the Holy See. I assured him that frequent opportunities would occur for manifesting this in a variety of ways, but that had I waited I should not be able to say Mass, and hoped this would plead my excuse. He then said the Pope's brief had been opened and translated and overwhelmed the President with a deep sense of gratitude.

I told him that the better he knew the Pope and the more intimate were their relations the more they would be gratified. He then asked me to give him a sketch of what I said on being presented, as it was the wish of the President to give his people a share of the pleasure he felt. I complied and we parted.[6]

The Secretary-General later called on him to set the date of the conference for the beginning of the following week, and Inginac assured him that everything would be done openly and honorably, and that he would try to conform to whatever the Apostolic Delegate should suggest. "All this", England writes, "looks well, but we have ugly business to get through yet. Perhaps God will open an easy way for us, as He did for His own chosen people, when they passed through the Red Sea waters unscathed."

The conference met on the day appointed (January 28) and Dr.

[6]Irish College *Portfolio,* p. 90, printed in *Seven Hills Magazine* (Dublin), vol. II, pp. 34-36.

England presented six propositions he had prepared, setting forth briefly the doctrines of the Church in regard to her organization and external relations. He showed how the Church is a Society founded by Christ on St. Peter and the Apostles, and that the authority of her ministers was derived not from any king or government but from this divine foundation; that these ministers, as the successors of the Apostles, ruled the Church, taught her doctrines, administered her Sacraments, and had the power of passing disciplinary laws and of enforcing them. No spiritual power was given either directly or indirectly to any king, emperor or republic, by which they could take part in the government of the Church; so that, if at any time a temporal power did participate in the affairs of ecclesiastical administration, it was only by virtue of an agreement between Church and State, and in the nature not of a right but of a concession. Each of the propositions had for its purpose the abrogation of definite anti-Catholic laws which had been made in the past by the Haitian government and which still obtained.

From the outset it became evident that the commissioners were not in full accord with the bishop's principles. In spite of the fact that they had promised to try to meet his demands, they showed they were far from willing to give up the power they had wrested from the Church. When Dr. England told them that the only way in which the Church could flourish would be by granting a more perfect liberty to the priests and bishops and a restoration of at least part of the Church property so that services could be carried on freely and in a manner ordained by the Church, they vigorously objected. A lengthy discussion took place over the fourth article: "*Le President d'Haiti nommera l'Archévêque et les Évêques: le souverain Pontife leur donnera l'institution canonique.*" They protested that, when the Government took part in the administration of Church property throughout the island, it was doing so, not by reason of any usurpation, but because it was its right. They objected to the details of some of the other propositions, and, despite Dr. England's efforts to make them see the reasonableness of his position, no agreement was reached. Finally it was decided to adjourn and to meet again on January 31.

In the meantime, England prepared three more propositions, which presented the case from a different aspect and outlined his position

more fully. The second conference met on the day appointed, and the new proposals were discussed. One of these dealt with jurisdiction in the island, which, he said, would have to reside in a Vicar-Apostolic, until a suitable bishop could be chosen from the native clergy. The commissioners protested that a native bishop should be appointed at once, and Dr. England's attempt to show them that a native bishop was not possible at the time, owing to the absence of a proper candidate for the position, brought his first real rebuff.

This was the main obstacle which blocked further negotiations. Again the legate tried to show them that jurisdiction would have to reside at least temporarily in a Vicar-Apostolic, but that later, when the Church was better established and there was a larger and more intelligent clergy, the Holy Father would then fill the episcopal Sees with native clergy. The commissioners again discussed the right of the State to direct the discipline of the Church, and Dr. England conceded that, if any clergyman were guilty of a political or civil crime against the State, he might be tried and punished by the State; but he held that jurisdiction in essentially ecclesiastical matters belonged to the Church alone. No agreement could be reached and again they adjourned.

A third and final conference was held on February 6. Bishop England was now on his guard lest any means be taken to defer a successful conclusion. He submitted nine more propositions, which made further concessions and provided for the erection of a seminary, where suitable young men might be educated for the priesthood. He called attention to the fact that the articles of the Constitution of Haiti, where they pertained to matters of religion, would have to be interpreted so as to harmonize with the principles of the Church. Many of the laws, he said, had been passed under circumstances adverse to the Catholic Faith and without previous proper counsel. These were incompatible with the doctrine and discipline of the Church and would have to be revoked or modified in such a manner as to conform with the Church's teaching. The Haitian Constitution had proclaimed that the Catholic religion would be protected. This protection was not being given, nor did the Church have the power to convoke provincial or diocesan synods; in fact, the free communication between the head and members of the

Church which was necessary to preserve ecclesiastical life had been curtailed, and the Catholics of Haiti were not permitted to consult with the Holy See. Then, too, the offerings of the faithful were being used for other purposes than the maintenance of religion and the clergy, and all financial administration had been taken entirely out of the hands of the clergy. Even the very amount of the offerings or stipends had been fixed by the State.

These things, Bishop England said, would have to be remedied, before a concordat would be acceptable to the Holy See. The commissioners did not take kindly to these proposals, and once more held out for the immediate appointment of a native bishop. They insisted that the Pope was trying to reserve for himself the administration of the Church, without any regard for the Government, and they recurred so often to the right of the President to appoint the bishops that Dr. England saw there was small hope of coming to an agreement. He learned, moreover, that an adjustment of affairs would be the occasion of great temporal loss to the officials of Haiti; and that, although the President wished to see the Catholic religion re-established, he wanted at the same time to retain an authority entirely incompatible with church organization. At one stage of the proceedings, it looked as if an adjustment would be reached, but the commissioners began to argue among themselves on the interpretation of one of the articles, and continued to such a length that it became evident that they were not sincere. England proposed deferring the conference for six or eight days, and they all agreed.

He was beginning to lose heart, however, and he made known to Boyer that he had foreseen what the outcome would be. Dr. England was already preparing to leave for Rome, since he was convinced that the men who were appointed to consult with him, were maliciously delaying the negotiations according to instructions. Without delay, he asked the President for a farewell audience, and, after explaining to him the nature of the settlement he was seeking to bring about, proved the baselessness of the difficulties and the objections which had been brought against it. Since there was small chance of doing any good, the only course left to him was to take his departure. Boyer then requested him to visit the churches and try to put things in order; but Dr. England replied that to do this would be useless since there was no principle on which religion

could be re-established, and there would be none until some understanding was reached. Even if a concordat were concluded, it would have been difficult to carry it out because of the lack of priests and the unwillingness of the Government to allow any but native clergy to be in authority. Moreover, the commissioners would have to abandon their suspicious attitude towards the Pope, who had no other object in view than the good of the people. They would have in addition to abrogate certain objectionable laws and leave to the Church the administration of church affairs. Dr. England stated that the nucleus of a clergy could be found by choosing twelve or thirteen young men of good character and inclined towards the priesthood who would be sent to Rome, where they would be well instructed, and where they could have an opportunity of learning how the Church was governed. He would go to Rome and would himself explain these matters to the Holy Father. The situation was a difficult one, but it was by no means desperate if the President would co-operate. With this statement of principle, the negotiations came to an end.

Boyer then wished to recompense him for his journey, but as Apostolic Delegate Bishop England refused to receive anything for himself unless it was concerned directly with his mission. The President insisted on defraying the expenses of his journey to Rome, and, when told approximately what they were, sent his nephew the next day with double the sum. Final preparations were now made to leave. At first, when it became known that he was going away, the vessel on which he had secured passage, was placed under an embargo, on the charge of carrying contraband; but after another conference with Boyer the embargo was raised and the first American Apostolic Delegate quitted the scene of his endeavors, leaving behind him assurances that, before the end of the year, he would come again and that the island would receive new and additional proofs of the good will of the Pope for the spiritual welfare of Haiti.

The closing scenes are described in a letter to Paul Cullen, from Port au Prince, dated February 14, 1834:

> I wrote to you four or five days since, accompanying my dispatch No. 5 to the Prefect of the Propaganda. This will accompany the duplicate of that dispatch, and probably will

leave this in a couple of days, more probably by way of England than of the U. S., in which case it might reach you before the other. But as I see very little chance of the former letter not reaching your hands I shall not here repeat its contents, which were a history of the manner in which our conferences were carried on. I gave the account of four; the results of which brought us to the state of things described in the dispatch. The last had been held on Thursday the 6th.

On Saturday I called on the President and had a long conversation with him in which I manifested the expectation I entertained of his zeal in having those laws which were harrassing to the Church, and degrading to the clergy, as well as those which assumed a right to interfere with jurisdiction, repealed and modified; and also my trust that although it could not perhaps be immediately procured from the other branches of the legislature, yet he might be spared long enough to have the honour of taking from the Statute Book of Haiti those laws permitting the marriage of persons who obtained divorces in those cases where they were not permitted by the divine law. He conversed long on this last topic, and told me that he did not see how my assertions agreed with the conduct of the Holy See, for that Napoleon after his divorce with Josephine was validly married to Maria Theresa with its consent. When I objected to the first union that there was no marriage, the answer was her recognition and coronation; but this was the consequence of circumstances, not the recognition of a valid marriage. I must here remark that permitting this transaction to remain notorious and without any official explanation to this day, has done more injury to Religion and to the honour of the Holy See at this side of the Atlantic than anything that I know of. This conversation led to other results both good and inconvenient, in which I hope the first may yet be found to predominate.

After this and other topics had been disposed of I arose to take my leave, but he detained me, and I soon found a new ground for my being able to stand a little more firmly. Expectations are entertained of my being able, by influence with some of my personal friends, to serve the interests of the Republic, to do which I have no objection, and to use which for the benefit of Religion I feel to be a duty.

After this he requested me to allow his family to be introduced and that I would sit with them for half an hour, which I did; and after chatting we parted in mutual kindness which I believe is on both sides sincere. Miss Petion, the daughter of the former President to whose widow Boyer is civilly mar-

ried, a young lady of about eighteen years of age, had that morning been at Confession, and the President, upon her entering the room, remarked upon it with satisfaction saying he knew it would gratify me.

Next day I dined with him at a very large party. He had invited me for the previous Sunday, but my feverish indisposition did not permit my availing myself of his kindness, and it was postponed. He placed me at the head of the table and on his right. I did my best to be as kind as possible in my manner not only to him but to all his officers of every colour and grade, of whom upwards of fifty were present; besides the English Consul General, Captain Courtenay of the Navy, an honest bold Catholic, the son of an Irishman, and the Swedish Consul General who is also the son of an Irish Catholic though educated a Protestant.

On Monday I gave a dinner to a party at which the negotiators and a few other principal officers were the guests, and we were most harmonious. But Tuesday came the tug of war. I sent a letter stating that I knew it would be gratifying to the Holy See to be informed of the actual state of things between the Government and the Bishop of Macri and the Archbishop of San Domingo; that ugly impressions were abroad which it would be well to correct, and that since I came to Port-au-Prince I had learned much which would tend to excuse the conduct of the Government; that it would be well to give an authentic statement to satisfy the Holy See that no slight was intended to the Pope nor interference with his authority. I have reason to know that unless I had taken this step the future Bishops would be exposed to great inconvenience. I repaired to the Conference and found that our nineteen articles had been mixed up in a protocol which reduced them to fourteen, and omitted several of my most important requisitions and some expressions were used which made me feel quite indignant. I am convinced that this was too visible upon my countenance, but I merely observed that I had acted foolishly and prematurely in having written to Rome that we had agreed, and to prepare the Holy See for a speedy conclusion, and that I told them that I was preparing to return and expected to leave the island in a few days.....

The President has invited me to spend this day with him in the country, and I am told his commissioners will be there also. I have proposed two substitutes which I shall try in succession, if I cannot get my first article passed. And after much reflection and consulting with Salgado who, I suspect, is the one most deeply interested, as he in all probability will

be the Archbishop, we both agreed that even with the omission of this article, the Concordat would be the salvation of the Catholic Religion in Haiti.

I shall stop here until I learn further. I am really tired, for I have worked incessantly, and the responsibility of the fate of a whole island and its hierarchy and liberties, perhaps for ages, upon me has contributed to weigh my mind down to a little under its usual elasticity.

Seven o'clock p. m. I have just returned from the country where I met a pretty party, most of whom, including the President and his family, observed the law of the Church respecting abstinence; and the health of the Holy Father was given in a very flattering manner, and very particular attentions paid to me. The negotiators were present, but we only fixed on Monday to meet at two o'clock. The Vicar-General and I were in one of the President's carriages, accompanied as usual, against my own wish, by a guard of honour; however, it perhaps is useful to permit it. Upon our way home he told me the President had a long conversation with him and told him that he would make every reasonable concession and use his best exertions to bring everything to a good conclusion. He also said that it was the President's wish, as soon as the Concordat was arranged, and my duty fulfilled, that I would consent to accept a commission from him to go on his part to Rome, and there make on the part of the Republic such arrangements as would be beneficial to the Haitian Church.[7]

Bishop England sailed from Port au Prince at the end of February, reached New York on March 14, 1834, and spent a few days in Philadelphia with Bishop Kenrick before proceeding to Charleston.

On his arrival (March 28), he began preparations for his journey to Rome. Naturally, the position he held caused considerable comment in the city, and, probably to clear up certain rumors abroad in Charleston at that time, Dr. England published in the *Miscellany* for April 5, 1834, an official statement of his mission in Haiti. Some passages from this statement, written in the third person shed light on the situation:

We have conversed with him upon the state of the church in Haiti; for the regulation of which he had been invested by the Holy See, with legatine powers of the fullest extent. He remained between five or six weeks at Port-au-Prince, and

[7] *Portfolio*, p. 105.

had ample opportunity of learning from various sources, as well as from his own observation, the situation of the church in the island. Though it is far from being pleasing, yet he entertains considerable hopes that it will improve . . . . The peculiar nature of the revolution and convulsions which have spread such ruin over that country, were specially destructive of religious order, and disastrous to discipline. The want of a sufficiently numerous clergy, and the character of the great bulk of those priests, who for years, have been engaged in the ministry, of the island, added to the desolation; and there is more cause for gratitude to heaven, because of the disposition which exists amongst great numbers to embrace and to re-establish religion, than for astonishment at the indifference and neglect of many others.[8]

On Saturday, April 19, Dr. England left Charleston for New York by the coastwise steamer *William Gibbons*. On May 13, the packet ship *Rhone,* on which he sailed en route for Rome, was entering the "mouth of the British Channel", and Dr. England began here a long letter to Paul Cullen which he hoped to finish in Havre "the day after tomorrow and to send by the first post, and, God willing, to travel after it as quickly as I can myself, so that probably within a week or ten days after this reaches you I may again be in the holy city." After discussing the affairs of the American Church and in particular the sad situation in New York caused by Bishop Dubois' maladministration of Church funds, he says:

Now for Haiti. I have said nothing yet and I have little to say; for until I go to Rome and deliver to the Pope a letter which I have from President Boyer, and know its contents and compare them with what I have seen and what he has said to me, I shall not know what advice to give. I declined making any Concordat after I found a few tricks on the part of the commissioners, but I took a very decisive step which at once brought Boyer and myself into contest; and I pointed out to him what I thought most congenial to the suggestion of Monsignor Mai, for whose judgment I have great respect. He then spoke to me in confidence, and begged of me to advise him and report to the Pope what passed between us. I shall be able to judge of his sincerity only when I shall know what he has written. The reformation of Haiti is possible, but it will be a laborious and trying undertaking. There is a people in many respects greatly interesting, but there are appalling

[8] *Cath. Misc.*, vol. XIII, p. 318.

obstacles. If the communication of Boyer agrees with what passed between him and me, I shall have hopes. But though my best reflections have been given to the subject, still it is surrounded by mighty difficulties through which I cannot clearly see my way. Still, I cherish the hope that the zeal of his Holiness for this island will be crowned with success. It would mortify me if he were disappointed.[9]

Dr. England reached Rome on May 28. The rumor of his being raised to the Cardinalate preceded him and caused him some embarrassment, but the Holy Father realized that it arose among enthusiastic friends in Ireland. The long *Relazione* on the Church in Haiti, which he presented to the Holy See on June 9, 1834, is one of the most interesting documents which ever left his pen.[10] In its seventy-six numbered paragraphs, the discovery, colonization and history of Santo Domingo and Haiti are described in terse, clear terms. Appended to the *Relazione* is a supplement of letters and official documents covering every detail of the negotiations with Boyer and the commissioners. The *Relazione* is a model of diplomatic skill. Many forgotten facts of Haitian history are given in this lengthy sketch, and not the least interesting is the trace Dr. England found in Haiti of the ubiquitous Trappist, Jeremiah O'Flynn, who had been conspicuous in Philadelphia in Archbishop Carroll's day.[11]

Although it was evident to the officials of Propaganda Fide that further negotiations were impossible unless the Haitian government yielded on the question of nomination to episcopal Sees, Pope Gregory XVI requested Dr. England to return to the island for the purpose of winning the government over to Church discipline on this delicate matter. Believing it to be a fruitless quest, he urged the Pope to relieve him of the legatine mission. Gregory XVI was unwilling to do this, because he believed that Dr. England would succeed owing to the tact and prudence he had displayed in the negotiations thus far. To lessen his anxiety about the Diocese of Charleston, the Pope suggested the appointment of a coadjutor-

---

[9] *Records* (ACHS), vol. VII, p. 482.

[10] Prop. Arch., *Scritt. rifer., America Antille*, vol. 5, pp. 1-50.

[11] In the *Australasian Catholic Record* (Sydney, N. S. W.), Rev. Eris O'Brien has been publishing during the past three years an exhaustive study of O'Flynn's life and labors, and his chapters contain interesting pages on John England's interest in Australia during the years he was a priest in Cork.

bishop for that See, promising to name an ecclesiastic to Dr. England's liking. The selection of Dr. William Clancy followed.[12]

During the months of July and August, 1834, while these matters were under consideration, Bishop England sent to the *Miscellany* a remarkable series of pen pictures of Rome as he saw it. These "Letters from Rome" are delightfully frank and must have caused considerable interest at the time of their publication. In one of these, dated July 25, he describes the scene when Martin John Spalding, later Archbishop of Baltimore, brilliantly defended 256 propositions from the field of philosophy and theology for the doctorate in divinity. One of his opponents at the public disputation was Father Anthony Kohlmann, S.J. Others who "objected" were Wiseman, Mezzofanti, Fornari, Perrone, and Modena. At a time when the Church was being hailed as the mother of ignorance in the anti-Catholic press of the United States, Dr. England's sketch of the learned societies and educational institutions of Rome was particularly valuable and was widely copied in the Catholic newspapers here.[13]

On August 21, 1834, Pope Gregory XVI wrote to President Boyer that all the documents presented by Bishop England had been carefully studied. The sad condition of the Church in Haiti was confirmed by the data presented by the Apostolic Delegate, and the Holy See regretted profoundly that none of the compromises offered by Dr. England had been accepted by the government. The crying need of the Haitian Church was the restoration of the hierarchy in that island, but this could not be done until a settlement were reached on the liberty of action necessary for a proper supervision by the Holy See. Boyer's own letter of February 25 to the Pope, which Dr. England had brought to Rome, had pleased the Holy See, for in it Gregory saw, he said, the President's sincere desire for the restoration of Catholic worship and discipline. The Pope had requested Dr. England to return to Haiti to renew the negotiations, and in a firm but paternal way he warned Boyer that in his own hands lay the future of spiritual peace in the island.

Dr. England started north with this pontifical letter and with further instructions for the Haitian situation. He had hoped while

---

[12]England to Whitfield, Rome, July 22, 1834 (BCA—Case 23—G7).
[13]*Works* (Reynolds), vol. IV, pp. 122-149.

in France to secure the services of a Religious Order of priests in filling the vacant churches of Haiti, but did not succeed.[14]

The rumor of his being a Cardinal *in petto* was still abroad when Dr. England reached Ireland in October. The Dublin *Freeman's Journal* for October 7, 1834, related the story of his mission to Haiti, and added: "We confidently trust ere long he will return to Europe to receive as some reward for all his labours and services a Cardinal's hat; for instead of receiving dignity from, should such an appointment take place, Doctor England will confer dignity upon, the sacred purple."

Bishop England left Liverpool on October 11, 1834, and arrived in Philadelphia on November 12. He wrote at once to President Boyer, stating that he would go to Haiti as soon as possible after reaching Charleston. To this letter Dr. England soon received an encouraging reply, and it began to appear as if Boyer were willing to resume the negotiations along canonical lines.

Meanwhile Dr. England was taken ill and his anxiety over the Haitian business was increased by the delay of his coadjutor, Bishop Clancy, who had been consecrated at Carlow on December 21, 1834, but, owing to circumstances which are explained in the next chapter, did not reach Charleston until November, 1835. President Boyer's patience was almost at an end, when he finally received Dr. England's message that he would soon be at Port au Prince.

The Apostolic Delegation to Haiti could not pass unnoticed in these intense years of the Abolition movement. In the South generally considerable ill-feeling had been aroused against Bishop England on account of his participation in the affairs of a Black Republic. The incident of the Abolition pamphlets at the Charleston Post Office, which has already been mentioned, occurred at this time, and Dr. England felt very keenly any misunderstanding of his stand on the question of slavery. How far his popularity in South Carolina had been weakened by the Haitian mission was plain to be seen when he went before the Legislature of that State in December, 1835, to obtain the incorporation of some Church property. A crisis had arrived in his Haitian mission. He tells the whole story in his own graphic way in a letter to Paul Cullen, on February 23, 1836:

I began my preparations for departing; but as the legisla-

[14]Irish College *Portfolio*, pp. 218-221 (England to O'Connor, Sept. 7, 1834).

ture met in December, I felt it necessary to attend at their session in Columbia to get some acts of incorporation passed for the Convents and Churches. I travelled thither in company with the two principal leaders of one of our great political parties who had been the two late Governors of the State (Generals Hayne and Hamilton) and with our most eminent jurist (Mr. Pettigrew) who led the opposition to them. They were all my most intimate acquaintances, and, although Protestants, by no means bigoted; and though we were two to two in politics, we were firm friends. We talked freely and confidentially, and they endeavoured to impress upon me the mischief that I would do to the Catholic Religion, not only in my own Diocess, but through the whole Southern country, by going then to Haiti, and affording the opponents of our Religion so plausible a pretext for creating prejudices amongst the slaveholders against our Church. I merely told them that they ought to know that I was opposed to the Abolitionists, who were most bitter enemies also to the Catholics, and that I was not backward to vindicate the South even against my friend O'Connell; and that having promised the Holy Father, I did not consider myself free now to hesitate. They gave the Pope credit for the zeal and purity of his motives, assured me that they had all confidence in me; but that the public feeling would, after my departure and when I could not defend myself, be excited against my Church and all its clergy in the South. I still was determined to proceed.

I always stood well with the Legislature in Columbia, and on this occasion the Governor (McDuffie) though opposed to me in politics, was exceedingly kind and attentive. It was usual on all previous occasions for the House of Representatives to pay me the compliment of inviting me to preach for them. On this occasion a motion was made to appoint a Committee for this purpose. In this House there are 120 members, and not one was a Catholic. About 40 voted for inviting me, and the rest against it. It had always been an unanimous vote for me. Two days afterwards I found, upon going into the Hall, a gentleman declaiming vehemently in favour of the Catholics, and could not understand his object until General Hayne came to me and said that he was renewing the motion to have me invited. I immediately left the Hall; and after the debate was over I returned and found the majority against me was greater. I also found the petitions for incorporating the Catholic institutions delayed in Committees; and those for Lutherans, Calvinists, Methodists, Baptists, &c. favourably reported. I went to several of the members to use their influence

to get the Catholic petitions passed. I was told confidentially that they had for me personally as much respect as ever; but that they were prejudiced against Convents &c., and wished to show their disapprobation of my going to Haiti. With some difficulty I got the petitions to pass the Committee of the House of Representatives merely by the casting vote of the chairman; the numbers being equal for and against it.

In the Senate, which consists of 40 of the most wealthy and best informed men in the State, the majority of the committee favoured the petitions; and the chairman of the committee brought those who opposed them to speak with me, and I removed their difficulties and procured an unanimous vote of that body. But I was told that upon the report of the committee of the Representatives being made to the House, a party was organized to vote against the report, and that it would probably be successful. I informed my friends of this, and General Hamilton, who is a Senator, procured from the Senate an invitation for me to preach for them in their Hall. The President of the Senate (Mr. Deas, a Protestant; in fact there is no Catholic in that body) and some other friends advised me to preach in advocacy of my own bills and to remove prejudices, and said that they would get the greater number of the Representatives to attend.

Nearly the whole Legislature was in the Hall, besides a large body of the literati &c. who had assembled on business of the College and to attend a literary society; which I also joined on the previous day by advice of my friends, though the subscriptions to those societies draws away a large share of my little means. I spoke for two hours; during which I recounted the indignity, injustice and persecution heaped upon the Catholics, and the manner in which the Carolinians had been deceived respecting them; I explained our principles of Church government, our efforts in the cause of fine arts and sciences, our rights under the Constitution of the State, the nature and objects of our religious institutions, and especially of those I sought to have incorporated; and I besought them, as they valued their good name, not to degrade Carolina by placing it by the side of Massachusetts. I had them in tears, and immoveable as so many statues. My friends told me it was one of my happiest efforts. In truth my whole soul and all my energy were thrown into it. I was myself in tears. I left Columbia that night on my way to Charleston to proceed thence to Haiti. My bills all passed without any opposition.

I had made my arrangements and, though sick from fatigue of mind and body, was upon the point of setting out in the

middle of December, when Doctor Clancy called on me to say that from all that he could see or hear, the ruin of Religion in at least my own Diocess, and probably in most of the slave-holding States, would be the consequence of my going to Haiti. He had conversed on the subject with some of the most respectable men of various creeds in the South, and they were unanimously of that opinion. He pointed out the critical state of our institutions, liable to be upset at any moment, unless supported by me who had (with one exception only, that of my connection with Haiti) the most perfect confidence of the great body of the citizens, and who was so fully acquainted with the men and the constitution of the South. He said that he would do all in his power, but that he saw that he could not succeed in the present crisis; a stranger and not a citizen, not knowing the laws or the people, and who, he must tell me in confidence, was in his conscience an Abolitionist. That he felt it his duty to tell me this; that he would die in the effort to do whatever I pointed out for his performance rather than abandon it, but he advised, besought and entreated me not to destroy the good I had just effected, and endanger Religion here at such a critical moment. That for his own part he would remain with me or go whithersoever I desired him, or forfeit his claim to the Diocess altogether and return to Ireland, as I should direct him. He entered at considerable length upon the topics and reasoning to sustain his advice. I felt it very forcibly, but told him I should give him no answer until we should pray and think more upon the subject.

My fatigue and anxiety brought on a heavy fit of sickness, and I was confined to my bed for ten days, and to my room for three weeks; and I was considerably debilitated for more than a month afterwards. The Catholics of the city had met on the day after I conversed with Doctor Clancy, and sent me an urgent and respectful memorial going over nearly the same grounds, and entreating that I would not expose them to ruin by persisting in my intention. Whether I judged rightly or not, I acted certainly not rashly, nor through any desire to avoid trouble, nor undervaluing the feelings or the wishes, or the confidence, of the Holy Father. But finding the pecuniary difficulties of the Diocess again pressing unpleasantly, having lost one of my best priests by death, one other having left his post to seek some less laborious and more profitable place elsewhere, finding others discontented with their destitution, I thought that, if the Holy Father were here on the spot, and saw this and more than this which it is unnecessary for me to

introduce here, he would advise and direct me to do as I have done. If I have misjudged, I deeply regret it.

This is the regulation which I have made: Retaining the powers with which the Holy Father vouchsafed to entrust me, I appointed Dr. Clancy my Vicar to do the Episcopal duties in Haiti until his return, or his loss of faculties by my act or that of the Holy See. I gave him the letter sent by his Holiness, together with the tokens of affection, the crucifix and golden medals, to be delivered to President Boyer, accompanied by a letter of mine stating that, since heavy sickness and the perplexed circumstances of my Diocess prevented my keeping my appointment, and fulfilling the anxious wishes of the Holy Father, I sent my Coadjutor to deliver the letter and the present of the Pope with which I had been charged; and to explain to him the absolute incapacity under which I at present was of obeying the directions of the Holy Father and ratifying my own wishes, as I hoped I should before long be able to do by visiting the Republic. In the meantime that Doctor Clancy was by me invested with such powers as I could communicate, to set in order and to superintend the Church of Haiti; if the President would see no reason to object to his acting temporarily as my Vicar. I wrote also to Salgado and to de Portez to the same effect; and I gave Dr. Clancy the most ample instructions and advice as to the course he should pursue; to remain, if he was successful, until he got further instruction from me or from the Holy See, and to correspond with me or the Propaganda or both; but if he found serious difficulties, I instructed him to return immediately hither, and that probably I could go in his stead, if there was a prospect of my being more useful. He was accompanied by one of my priests (Byrne) whom he selected, and by a coloured man, a candidate for orders from Ireland, whom I encouraged to proceed thither. Doctor Clancy left on the 26th of December for New York, as it is from that port the vessels for Port-au-Prince generally sail. But the winter has been so severe that he could not have sailed before the middle of this present month, for the harbour of New York was frozen over and vessels icebound; therefore he has not yet arrived at Haiti, which is about 14 days sail from New York. I scarcely expect to hear from him until the end of March or the beginning of April, and cannot therefore say what will be the result of this arrangement.[15]

The press of Port au Prince carried the news of Dr. Clancy's ar-

[15] *Records* (ACHS), vol. VIII, pp. 221-227.

rival on February 27, 1836. He was received the next day by President Boyer, who, however, showed in a marked way his regret that Dr. England had not come personally. Dr. Clancy charmed all whom he met by his affability of temper and his courtly manners, but Boyer refused to enter into official negotiations with him. On March 21, 1836, Boyer wrote to Gregory XVI, in answer to the letter sent by His Holiness on August 21, 1834:

> The perusal of Your Holiness' letter has strengthened the conviction I have always had of Your Holiness' solicitude for the good of religion in this Republic. I have no doubt but that the choice which has been made of Monseigneur England as spiritual head of the Church here is a proof of this pontifical care of us. It was with keen regret I sent a letter which that prelate wrote to me from Charleston on December 21, 1835, telling me that owing to a variety of circumstances, chiefly an attack of pleurisy, he would be unable to come to Haiti and was obliged to send his coadjutor, Bishop Clancy. Your Holiness will share my regret that in so important a matter as the creation of a hierarchy for Haiti, it has been impossible for Dr. England to continue personally our negotiations on the concordat . . . . The absence of Dr. England has caused a serious check to our deliberations. Monseigneur Clancy cannot replace Dr. England in so delicate a matter. Dr. England alone has the power of making a decision upon the necessity of preserving intact the government's right of naming the bishops here... A concordat that will preserve the canon law and the civil law by establishing harmony between the spiritual and temporal powers is today, as it has always been, the object of my most earnest solicitude.

Boyer then begged Gregory XVI not to abandon the negotiations already begun, and promised to use all his influence with the commissioners to decide upon the articles of the concordat.

That same day, Boyer wrote to Dr. England, expressing his sympathy over the latter's illness and urged the Bishop to come as soon as possible. The President repeated the fundamental proposition which the Holy See must accept before a corcordat would be voted—"*La dignité de la Republique exige qu'elle soit traitée par la Cour de Rome sur le même pied que les autres états independants. Ce n'est point ici question d'amour propre; c'est une question de principe sur laquelle reposent les plus graves intérêts.*"

Dr. Clancy's visit to Haiti is described in one of Bishop England's letters to Paul Cullen, dated Charleston, April 2, 1836:

I yesterday got a letter from Dr. Clancy from Port-au-Prince. He has been received in the most flattering manner by the President, who exhibited evident signs of joy at receiving the crucifix and medals sent by his Holiness, and also the letter. The unfortunate Salgado had died a fortnight previous to the arrival of Dr. C., an unrepenting profligate, who had the art to conceal his crimes from many during his life, but who absolutely refused the aids of religion at his death, and had amassed great sums of money.

The Government wishes to make the Concordat which had been arranged between them and me, and which is among the documents I submitted to the Holy See, and from Dr. Clancy's letter to me I should not be astonished if he had gone to Rome for the purpose, though I should hope he has not. I have written to him to stay in Hayti, or, if he did not wish to do so, to come hither and that I would go there and leave him in charge of this Diocess. . . . . I am of the same opinion that I before expressed that his continuance there, if he consents, will be the means of introducing without formality a Vicar Apostolic, which in the present state of things is the mode best suited to its wants. But if they will not be satisfied without a Concordat, I would give them one if I could get all the security I wanted. I do entertain great hopes; but the clergy is horrible, and the difficulty is to find a proper supply.

I desired Dr. C. to ask the President permission in my name to introduce those French missionaries who offered their services to the Pope, and I hope we may succeed. If I found myself at liberty to devote the remainder of my days to forming an establishment for the Irish youth upon the plan I suggested to you, the vast wants of extensive and destitute regions, that are now in ruins, could be to a considerable extent supplied. But it is useless to turn to this.

I am much better in health, thank God, but more than occupied and greatly in want of a few efficient priests, and nearly exhausted in pecuniary resources.

I think the spirit of persecution here has been curbed and will begin to decline. The Negro question is also losing its virulence. But our Florida war still rages. I can write no more, as I shall otherwise be late for the boat which takes this letter, unless I shall omit the office of this morning (Holy Saturday) . . . . I shall endeavour to send a Report to the Propaganda before I leave for the visitation of Georgia, for which I depart, God willing, next Tuesday.

In communicating this to his Holiness, assure him of my humble devotion, and warm gratitude, and that I shall not omit anything in my power to meet his wishes respecting Hayti, until he can find some better mode than that of leaving it in my hands; and I pray that this may be soon. Give my affectionate and respectful regards to Cardinals Weld and Castracane, and remember me kindly to Mr. and Mrs. Englefield and my other friends.[16]

A few days later (April 5), Dr. Clancy returned to Charleston, and another letter (April 9) from Dr. England to Cullen gives additional information, especially on Salgado, Vicar-General of Port au Prince, who had died some weeks before Dr. Clancy's arrival:

I have but a few moments to write. Dr. Clancy has returned from Hayti, having merely presented the letters and presents, heard confessions and given Communion to about 300, and confirmed about 450, which, with the number confirmed by me, makes about 700 confirmed in Port-au-Prince. I wished him to stay; but either they politely bowed him out of the island, or he had an impression that he ought merely to bring me the answer to the Pope's letter. However, I have now no time to ask or examine, nor does it matter. I have but one plain duty to perform and must leave the result to God. I have been confided in by the Pope to save Hayti, if I can. I shall make the effort, by placing myself in the hands of God, in a little schooner of 75 tons with four men. I have hired her at $400 per month, and pay port charges and my own provisions and those of any one that I may take along. The priest who offered to go with me now refuses. I shall try to get another. If I cannot, I shall go alone. You can see my letter to the Propaganda when I go. . . . .

Say to the Holy Father that, however I dislike it, I am under the impression that a Concordat will be necessary. I shall by all means try to avoid it, but it is far better than to keep things as they are.

Adieu, the time presses. I must prepare. I have much to do, and it will serve no purpose to speculate upon this paper. I know the cry here will be very unpleasant; but to lose Hayti without a struggle would be worse.[17]

Dr. Clancy's description of the attempt he made to reopen the negotiations was sent to Paul Cullen on April 10, 1836:

---

[16]Irish College *Portfolio*, p. 123.
[17]*Ibid.*, p. 124.

I wrote to you in December, previous to my departure for Hayti—you have (I am sure) communicated the contents to his Holiness, and Cardinal Fransoni. I must trouble you again to communicate the contents of this epistle to the Pope, and such Cardinals as may feel an interest in such matters. The clergyman and student who accompanied me to Port-au-Prince as well as myself were received by the people and the Government with every mark of respect. The pilot who took us ashore, and offered to show us the Presbytery stood at the corner of the streets, and in the market place, and shouted out "L'Évêque", "L'Évêque." You may imagine the thousands this proclamation drew around us. I wrote a note to the President after my arrival asking an interview in order to present the Pope's letter, the crucifix, and medals which were sent through Dr. England; but not delivered until I went. He appointed ten o'clock on Sunday morning and sent his own carriage with soldiers, and an aide-de-camp as a guard of honour. I went in my episcopal dress. And after a few words of introduction presented the letter and presents. He expressed the deepest sense of obligation and gratitude to the Holy Father; and said he would keep them as the richest treasures he had ever received.

On the next day he sent three commissioners to wait upon me, and ask in his name whether I was authorized by the Holy See to bring their ecclesiastical affairs to a conclusion. I said I was by no means authorized by the Pope to do any thing in their regard, that the circumstances of my coming there merely arose out of the impossibility of the Legate's visit for the present, who was ill, and also very peculiarly circumstanced in the United States, and that any spiritual authority I may exercise in the island was delegated by him to me for the sake of the people. They said that in the Pope's letter to the President His Holiness alluded to some difficulties in their laws *without specifying them* and that in fact nothing could ever satisfy them but a concordat similar to that given to the Kings of France. I told them I should be happy to receive any communication for the Pope which I would either transmit or deliver personally, when convenient to them and myself. I gave President Boyer's answer to Bp. England on my arrival here which he undertook to send to Rome. There are in the diocese about 50 priests—French, Spanish, and Corsicans. With very few exceptions their moral and literary characters are as low as it is possible to imagine. In fact I have some evidence that a portion of them are men who have been suspended, and excommunicated for schism, heresy, and vices of an abominable

nature. It was Lent when I arrived—no regulations had been made for its partial, or general observance, no instructions, nor confessions in the church at Port-au-Prince. The Vicar-General Salgado had died a few weeks before my arrival. He not only did not prepare for death like a christian by receiving absolution, Eucharist, and Extreme Unction; but absolutely refused the last sacraments when asked to receive them by one of his priests . . . . Notwithstanding this death, and the notoriety of his iniquitous life he is buried at the left of the high altar, they had an Office and High Mass for the repose of his soul, and all public honors were paid by the President and functionaries at his funeral. The priests came to me, and begged of me not to do any public duty until I was authorized by the *Government bureau.* I told them I despised them for their advice—that I recognized no more right in any layman or number of laymen to tell me when, where, or how to officiate than I did in themselves; and consequently on the following Sunday I sang the Grand'Messe, and Vespers—preached twice on Penance, and the necessity of confession particularly—published regulations for Lent, just the same as in America, ordered public prayers and religious instructions every evening during Lent. And I have the consolation of looking back with some pleasure on my firmness in the discharge of duty, as the people co-operated beyond all my expectations with the graces offered to them. They refused to place any confidence in the clergy, generally speaking, in the tribunal of confession. Consequently I was obliged with my chaplain, Rev. Mr. Byrne, and one Corsican priest to sit every morning and evening for 4 weeks about 3 hours a day hearing general confessions of adults from 20 to 70 years of age. I administered Confirmation to seven hundred and fifty men, women, and children of every colour and country. About five hundred received the Eucharist. And it is my firm conviction that if I had ten priests with me in whom the people would confide in the tribunal of confession I would have had 5 or 6 thousand persons for Confirmation, and the Easter duty. I had to refuse hundreds the oportunity of being heard. The people are well-disposed, and *essentially Roman Catholic* notwithstanding the immoralities, infidelity, and Jansenism of many of their clergy who were to them wolves in sheep's clothing. This is a miracle in the moral order which proves how deeply and securely the true faith is preserved by God in the heart and understanding, in despite of the negligent and nefarious lives of these priests. Neither the President nor persons in high offices attend Mass on Sundays. There is a military review in a public

market at the very hour of the Grand'Messe, and in the vicinity of the church.[18]

The Abolition excitement in Charleston had died down sufficiently to enable Dr. England to return to Haiti without any unpleasant consequences. He left about the middle of April and reached Port au Prince on May 7. Three days later he sent to Rome in the British Consul's care a letter telling Dr. Cullen of the situation which had arisen in his absence:

> I arrived here after rather an unpleasant passage in my little schooner and anchored at between 8 and 9 on the evening of Saturday April the 30th within a league of the town. Next day, Sunday, the festival of SS. Philip and James, I celebrated Mass in my apartments, dined with the President, and on Monday called on him by appointment and conversed with him during nearly two hours, when he said he would appoint a commission to treat with me. On Thursday night I got high fever, by which I was confined to my bed Friday and most of Saturday, when in the evening General Inginac visited me and after many efforts to dive into a variety of matters said that the commission was named but that my illness prevented their proceeding to business. I said that I was sufficiently recovered and ready at any moment. He said they did not wish to trouble me yet. I was able to say Mass yesterday (Sunday) and this day, and am, thank God, quite well. The notary who attended the former commission called this morning to know if my health would permit our commencing tomorrow. I said "Certainly", and we fixed half past eight a. m. The commissioners are five—amongst whom there is one honest man who really wishes the establishment of religion. I have tried and studied and the more I examine, the more I find the difficulties of the case, but I have come to one conclusion, that unless some security be had by a concordat there will not be any possibility of having it by anything else, and if I can by acceding to this mode secure the power of the Bishops in their administration, and the authority of the Holy See in its apostolic charge—primacy of jurisdiction, I have determined to accede, if they desire it, to forming one which I trust the Holy See will not find a difficulty in ratifying, though the execution will not be a work of dispatch or of facility. I know that some of the most powerful officers have been projecting a schism, and that probably they have now in Europe agents to find some one of the deprived bishops in France who will confer Orders, but

[18] *Seven Hills Magazine*, vol. II, pp. 186-189.

still I trust that besides the principle of Faith, which remains in many, I shall be able to convince them, that in their position, an affectionate alliance with the Holy See would be the greatest political benefit to themselves.

The difficulties are great, but the question is of nearly a million of souls and of the generations to succeed them. I shall leave this open until after the conference tomorrow.

Since eight o'clock this morning (10th May, Tuesday half past one o'clock), I have been plagued with the Commissioners until this minute. Nothing but a concordat, and I had to fight my way through every inch upon every expression. They say we will agree and unless they change between this and our next meeting the expressions which have now been allowed to stand, I am of opinion that it will be better to come to a conclusion. We meet again upon Thursday, and then I shall be able to form some definite motion upon the subject. Adieu, I must hasten to close my letter as the hour for sending it off presses.[19]

Dr. England realized finally that a concordat was well nigh impossible. However, as he wrote on May 14, to Cardinal Fransoni, he had no intention of closing the door to peace, and had therefore drawn up another concordat which contained the positive limits of compromise. That same day he wrote as follows to Dr. Cullen:

After a most laborious and painful set of conferences and some little sickness in most oppressive weather, I at length see some hope for this island. The whole question lay between losing the island to the Church and making a Concordat. Of course I had no choice, and made every effort to secure first, all that was essential to doctrine, discipline and the rights of the Holy See; and next, whatever I could for the freedom of the Church from secular domination. I acknowledge to you I was often in despair and upon the point of breaking off. But when the question presented itself to me: "Will you make no further effort for a million of souls, and the millions to succeed them, and for those that may be influenced by them", I used every effort to distinguish as well and as accurately as I could, the principle which could never be surrendered, from the accident to which it was attached.

This day we have come to a sort of agreement. It is anything but what I could wish; but it is all that I could obtain. I trust that I have saved every essential; but I cannot say more. To me the concessions have been most painful, but I stated

[19] *Ibid.*, pp. 190-193.

plainly that I may be mistaken, and that, until the Holy See would examine and ratify, my acts could not bind the Pope; that he must examine and be himself convinced that I had not surrendered any of the doctrines or essential discipline of the Church, nor any of the rights or honours of the Holy See. With this understanding, I said that if we agreed upon what was now read, I should sign it subject to the ratification of the Holy See, though the treaty was by no means to my liking. They fixed then, to meet again next Tuesday the 17th, and then come to a final determination. I should hope that although the liberties of the Church are greatly crippled, and much that I expected to secure is given up, I have still protected all that is essential. Should I be mistaken, Rome has only to withhold her sanction, declaring that I have exceeded my powers or have been mistaken in my concessions. Of course I feel that it is better that I should be censured than that Religion should be injured. Yet I am persuaded that, however unpleasant those concessions may be, it is far better they should be made than that all hope of Religion in this island should be blasted.

You will be good enough to communicate this to the Holy Father with as little delay as possible. I shall, God willing, leave the island before the end of the month. I do not think that another opportunity will offer before that time for sending you any further account. It is possible that I may be required to be myself the bearer of the treaty to Rome; though I have more than once told them that it would be greatly preferable to send one of their own ambassadors. They do not appear disposed to do so. Should I not go I shall send a detail of what I have done, and of the motives by which I have been induced; and I should hope that no delicacy towards me would prevent the Holy Father from plainly and openly refusing to sanction or to palliate any mistake into which I may have fallen, by which the interests of Religion may be in any way compromised. Though I feel that, abandoned and alone, I have acted according to the dictates of my conscience and to the best of my judgment.[20]

Then follows a list of fifteen principles upon which the proposed Concordat was to be based.

If I have done wrong [he writes to Cullen on the following day (May 15)], the Pope has only to refuse his ratification and the whole is at an end. I have acted to the best of my judgment, and I may have erred, and shall be quite pleased, if I

[20]Irish College *Portfolio*, p. 123.

have mistaken, to have my blunder rendered harmless, and religion saved, but the more I reflect the more I believe that I had no choice and that there was no other way left to save this island; at present I am under the impression that if I had not acted as I have done, I would have betrayed my duty; and the disclosures that have been made since yesterday confirm me in this opinion. Tuesday the 17th is fixed for our next meeting, when I hope we will conclude.

He was never, he declared in this letter, which is too long to quote in full, placed in greater difficulties nor had he ever suffered so much anxiety over any affair in which he was responsible. Beset continually by spies and false brethren, he found that priests, whilst they fawned upon him, were conspiring to ruin all his chances of success with the Haitian government. "Besides these, the Methodists, Baptists and other Evangelicals from the U. S. sent to their brethren every document they could find to prove that I was an enemy to the abolition of slavery, that I had abused O'Connell for his reproaches against American Slave-holders, and that I was quite a friend to the Southern institution of the U. S., slavery included."[21] The failure of these three years' negotiations is foreshadowed in a letter to Dr. Cullen a few days later (May 18):

I have nothing particular to add to my last information, but to announce that on yesterday we signed the concordat, and I entered into the full administration of the Church of Hayti, and I had some conversation with the President, which I presume showed him that he was a great gainer by what he had done. For many reasons I shall have to go to Europe. Of course one of my principal duties will be performed as soon as possible, that is, to visit Rome, explain to the Holy Father what I have done, and why I did so, and request his sanction. May God help whatever uphappy wight shall be doomed to begin the work of cleansing this augean stable. My work, in all conscience, was heavy enough, but his will be far heavier and more disagreeable. If you know any one who wishes to endure a living martyrdom and to wear a crown of the worst thorns within a mitre, let him make interest to be sent as Bishop hither, and his full wishes shall be gratified. Thank God, I am about to leave it before ten days, and once more get tossed upon the ocean in my little schooner, which the President says I must have been mad when I embarked in; but the same God

[21] *Seven Hills Magazine*, vol. II, pp. 193-196.

still rules the winds and waves. My great doubts are whether I shall be allowed to remain in Charleston.[22]

On June 3, 1836, Dr. England was back in Charleston, and two weeks later he wrote to Bishop Rosati from New York, announcing his immediate departure for Rome to bring his Apostolic Delegation to a close. On June 24, he sailed for Liverpool, and in September reached Rome with the tentative concordat ready for the decision of the Holy See. In spite of Dr. England's explanations that a refusal to consider the concordat, notwithstanding its obnoxious articles, might plunge what little Faith remained in the island into complete darkness, Gregory XVI had "an utter dislike to make a treaty and special objections to that which has been signed", as Dr. England wrote to Paul Cullen on October 1, 1836. "I fear that I have done irreparable mischief", he adds. The articles of the concordat which met with Boyer's acceptance and which Dr. England had signed on May 17, subject to a subsequent ratification by the Holy See, were of such a sweeping character that they were not approved; but Bishop England hoped that with them as a working basis some compromise might be reached. President Boyer's letter to Pope Gregory, dated May 18, which was presented to His Holiness by Dr. England, left, however, no avenue for harmonious action on the part of the Holy See.[23]

The Pope had been informed privately by a former missionary in Haiti, Father Texier-Olivier, then resident in Paris (February 20, 1836), that Dr. England's mission had not only brought no peace to the Church in Haiti but had accentuated the Gallican stand of the government in its attitude towards the Catholic religion. "The mission of the American bishop whom Your Holiness delegated has borne very sad results, and I have reason to believe that this prelate, so worthy of merit in so many respects, has erred badly in judgment in handling not only the problem itself but the persons and the details connected with it."

This, unfortunately, was true. Dr. England had been deceived in Boyer, with whom latterly, however, he was always on his guard; he was deceived in Father Salgado in whom he confided his hopes and fears of the situation, and who was Boyer's confidential inform-

---

[22]*Ibid.*, p. 197.
[23]Prop. Arch., *Scritt. rifer., Amer. Cent.*, vol. 5, No. VIII.

ant on Dr. England's plans; and he had been even more sorely deceived in Dr. Clancy, who even at this time was clamoring for a change from Charleston.

All this must have had an arresting effect upon the estimate the Sacred Congregation and other high officials in Rome placed upon Bishop England. That he had failed in Haiti was not a surprise; others had failed before him, as others were to fail after him. But it was hard for the Holy See to overlook mistakes of judgment, especially of judgment of persons.

John England was fifty years old at this time. His once strong constitution was weakened and shattered by the unsparing demands made upon his health and energies in the sixteen years of his episcopate. Illnesses came too frequently to allow him to depend upon his forces very long, and the long tedious journeys both at home and abroad had taken fatal toll of his physical powers. Added to his consciousness of defeat in the Haitian negotiations, was the realization that four years of his life had been given outside his diocese to a fruitless quest of religious peace in the island. It was unfortunate, also, that this episode in Dr. England's career occurred in the pontificate of a Gregory XVI.

The Holy See did not intend to give a peremptory refusal to President Boyer's Gallican constitution of the Haitian Church, and on October 10, 1836, Gregory XVI wrote to Boyer, urging him to make a study of the Church in other parts of the western world and to recognize the security of other governments where the Church lived in freedom according to her own laws. Again Dr. England was to be sent, not only empowered with jurisdiction over the Church in Haiti but also to appeal to the Government in the Pope's name to establish peace and order in the spiritual life of the nation. Boyer was asked to receive Dr. England in all benignity and with every mark of honor due his exalted station.[24]

Dr. England sailed from Liverpool on November 16, 1836, for New York. He knew, as he had informed Archbishop Slattery of Cashel on November 7, that there was no hope of a concordat, but he meant to carry out Pope Gregory's instructions; namely, to try to succeed in obtaining liberty for the Church without a concordat. Boyer's insatiable desire to secure control of the spiritual destinies

[24]Cf. *Juris Pontificii de P. F.* (De Martinis), vol. V., pp. 164-165.

of the Republic stood between the Holy See and any regularly organized hierarchical jurisdiction. After reaching New York on December 30, Dr. England was obliged to wait for thirteen days on account of the ice in New York harbor before he could get a boat for Charleston. He left New York on January 11, 1837, arriving in Charleston on the seventeenth. On the twenty-second he held the Thirteenth South Carolina Convention, in Charleston. "To him who addresses you," he said to the delegates present,

> It is a subject of deep regret that since he has last had the gratification of meeting you, so little of his time has been spent in his own Diocess. No one can feel it more acutely than he does himself. Though his labours have been heavy, his endurances frequent and protracted, the difficulties which surrounded him not of little moment, the obstacles which impeded the progress serious and varied, and the demands for his exertion greater than he could meet; yet some of the happiest days of his ministerial career have been spent amongst you, and the objects which he would most willingly seek to attain are still to be achieved in this place and by your exertion. Here too are to be found those who have grown up around him as his co-operators, those who in good and in evil report have shared his toil, have partaken of his trials and been found faithful to posts which others have abandoned. Were there then, even no bond of religious obligation, yet would the feelings of natural affection retain him where the recollections of the past and the hopes of the future bring to his soul associations which in their blending are calculated to soothe and to cheer him. If therefore he was compelled to be absent, you may feel assured that it was not by his own seeking, but greatly against his inclination. You are already aware of its cause, and however unworthy or disqualified he may feel himself, it was not his prerogative to oppose an obstinate refusal to the desire of the Vicar of Jesus Christ.
>
> But though from a sense of duty he had accepted the commission with which he was honoured, he also felt that he was at liberty to use all reasonable means to procure that by having it placed in the hands of some one more competent, he might be left at liberty to devote his entire attention to the cultivation of that portion of the vineyard for which a connexion of years had created in his heart a peculiar attachment. On a former and on a more recent occasion he besought a release upon these grounds, but in neither instance has he succeeded.
>
> He trusts that you need not his entering into any long dis-

sertation to convince you that in obeying his superior he has only done his duty, and that however he might be sustained by the letter of the law, in originally declining to meet the wishes of the supreme pontiff, yet that in using an abstract right he would be acting against the spirit of our institutions, and that having once undertaken the duty, it would be in violation of every correct principle for him to refuse his services, however little calculated they may seem in his own view to effect their object, whilst in the estimate of those who employed him, they are regarded to be worth having.[25]

On February 17, 1837, Dr. England left Charleston for New York in hope of sailing on the regular weekly packet to Haiti. A few days later, while off the capes of Delaware Bay (February 21), he wrote a long account of the state of the Church in Charleston to Paul Cullen, in which he admits that he has little hope of success:

I have got letters from Haiti which show me that they have learned the fact of my arrival in the United States. They are from priests at Port-au-Prince and full of intrigue and recrimination. They however shew that bad priests, especially from Corsica, have crowded in since my departure, and the several parties are taking measures to strengthen their functions, between freemasons, fanatics, infidels and Methodists. What a comfort for unfortunate me! However, I must face it for my sins, though it is a pretty penance.[26]

On his arrival in New York (February 26,) he completed his letter, stating that he would leave in a few hours for Haiti. When he reached Port au Prince and presented the documents from the Holy See, President Boyer refused to continue the negotiations. This brought Dr. England's mission to an end. He returned in time to take part in the Third Provincial Council of Baltimore (April 16-23, 1837).

When negotiations were resumed in 1841 by Bishop Rosati, who was sent in Dr. England's place, the Bishop of St. Louis signed a concordat with the Haitian Government containing the identical clauses which Dr. England had urged Pope Gregory XVI to accept. The *Annales* of the Society for the Propagation of the Faith for

---

[25]*Cath. Misc.*, vol. XVI, p. 225.
[26]*Seven Hills Magazine*, vol. II, p. 207.

1842 contain a letter from Bishop Rosati, dated Paris, April 14, 1842, giving the results of his visit to Haiti.[27]

In June, 1837, Bishop Clancy's resignation as Coadjutor-Bishop of Charleston was announced, and with his departure in July of that year, the Haitian mission may be said to have lapsed. It had cost Dr. England many sad hours during these years. Had Dr. Clancy possessed equal apostolic zeal and virtue with the Bishop of Charleston, another story might be written.

---

[27]Nothing came of the concordat Bishop Rosati had agreed to, because of the Revolution which broke out in 1843. President Boyer was sent into exile, and a dictator was set up in the person of Charles Herard. Santo Domingo proclaimed its independence as a republic on February 27, 1844, and a period of war set in between the two republics. Santo Domingo received an Archbishop in 1848. The See became vacant in 1858. In 1860 Archbishop Antonio Zerezano is listed by Gams, and in 1862 the See was occupied by Archbishop Benvenuto Monzon y Martino, who was transferred to Granada, Spain, in 1866. The description of the Church in Santo Domingo after that date is given tersely by Gams (*Series Episcoporum* etc., p. 491)—"*Sedes deserta. Incolae ad paganismum revoluti.*" Meanwhile, in the western part of old Hispaniola (Haiti), the Church was in a worse condition than during Boyer's presidency. It was not until March 28, 1860, that relations were resumed between the Holy See and Haiti. The agreement reached at that time rules the Church in Haiti today, and it is interesting to note that it differs very little from the concordat which Bishop England urged the Holy See to approve. Cf. St.-Jacob-Neher, *Kirchliche Statistik und Geographie von Amerika*, pp. 399-404 (Ratisbon, 1868); also *Haiti's Belated Hierarchy*, by Furey, in the *Ecclesiastical Review*, vol. LXXVI (March, 1927), pp. 241-257.

CHAPTER XXVIII

Coadjutor-Bishop William Clancy

(1834-1837)

We now come to the least fortunate of all Bishop England's acts, the appointment of a coadjutor to the See of Charleston.

Bishop England sailed from New York on the *Belvedera*, Captain Holsa, for Liverpool, on July 10, 1832. The purpose of this, his first visit to Europe since his arrival in Charleston in 1820, was known to all his priests and people: the need of priests for the three States under his jurisdiction and the need of money. The daily papers of Charleston spoke of his departure in terms of profound regret. "As a divine, a scholar, a patriot, and a friend", both Catholics and Protestants felt that they were losing him. No rumor was abroad at this date of his dissatisfaction with church administration, but there was always the anxiety among his friends that he would be transferred to another See in the United States or to one in Ireland.

The details of his journey from Liverpool to Cork, Bandon, Dublin, Paris and Rome have been already mentioned in these pages. One incident of the journey to Rome which has not been chronicled and which has a place in this chapter, is the conferring of an honorary degree of Doctor of Divinity on Rev. Patrick McSweeney, then Rector of the Irish College in Paris, on October 24, 1832. Dr. McSweeney was a priest of the Diocese of Cork and had been a professor in St. Mary's Seminary there when John England was President of that institution. Dr. England presided at the ceremony in Paris, administering the oath to his companion of former days.

Dr. England's stay in Rome was from Christmas Day, 1832, until June, 1833. It was after he had completed his report on Charleston before the Sacred Congregation de Propaganda Fide that Pope Gregory XVI decided to ask him to accept the arduous and delicate Haitian mission. His commission as Apostolic Delegate to Haiti is dated March 15, 1833. On June 5, he was at Leghorn on

the return journey to Ireland, but no thought of a coadjutor had then entered his mind; for, in a letter to Paul Cullen of that date, he would appear to be in excellent spirits and profoundly touched and encouraged by the attention and courtesy shown him in Rome. Later, in letters to Dr. Cullen, from Cork, no mention is made of his needing the assistance of a coadjutor-bishop.[1] Writing from Waterford on July 20, he mentioned the fact that the priests of Kildare-Leighlin had approached him for the purpose of recommending him for that diocese, whose episcopal See was Carlow, where his old college was. Bishop Doyle, the "J. K. L." of Irish history fame, though born the same year as John England and consecrated Bishop about the same time (1819), was then broken in health and seeking an auxiliary. The two prelates had always been close friends, and the days spent together in Carlow at this time must have been particularly delightful to two veterans who had fought boldly and victoriously for the freedom of Ireland.[2] It was at this time, as we have seen, that Dr. Slattery, then President of Maynooth, had urged Bishop England to stand for the Archiepiscopal See of Cashel. The suffragan Bishops of Cashel had also spoken to Dr. England asking him to allow them to propose his name to the Holy See. But Dr. England had given his promise to the Holy Father to go to Haiti, and that bound him, as he felt, almost by oath. Besides, as has been stated, his affection for America and for Charleston outweighed all other honors and promotions. During his stay in Cork the consultors of the Diocese of Cloyne and Ross also requested that he would permit his name to be placed as *dignissimus* for the succession to that See.

The first period of his Haitian mission lasted from January 19 to March 12, 1834. After a few weeks in Charleston, Dr. England left for Rome, reaching the Eternal City some time in June, 1834. It was during this second residence in Rome that he decided the presence of a coadjutor in Charleston was necessary; and he fixed upon Paul Cullen for that post. That he had Dr. Cullen's consent is evident from the extant letters. The Irish College *Portfolio* con-

[1]Irish College *Portfolio*, p. 94.

[2]The Rev. Edward Nolan, Professor of Theology at Carlow, who had been on the *terna* for Charleston in 1820, was appointed (cf. Gams, *Series Episcoporum*, p. 489).

tains copies of letters of introduction which he gave at this time to his sister (Mother Catherine), to his brother Edward and to his brother-in-law (Michael Barry) to introduce to them Dr. Cullen, who was going to Ireland for a short visit before his consecration.

Paul Cullen was a young priest at this time. He had made so distinguished a course of studies at Propaganda that, immediately after his ordination to the priesthood in 1825, he was appointed to the Chair of Sacred Scripture and Hebrew in Propaganda University. In 1832, he became Rector of the Irish College and held this post until 1850, when he was consecrated Archbishop of Armagh. Two years later he became Archbishop of Dublin, and in 1867 was given the Cardinal's hat, the first Irish bishop on whom that dignity was conferred. He died in 1878. During his quarter of a century in Rome he was the trusted correspondent of the Irish hierarchy and of many of our American bishops.[3]

Dr. England met Paul Cullen during his first visit to Rome, and a warm friendship quickly sprang up between them. Two facts seem certain from the correspondence of these early months of 1834: Dr. England's repeated requests made to the Holy Father to relieve him of the Legation to Haiti on account of the condition of affairs at Charleston, and the Pope's refusal; and Paul Cullen's acquiescence in Dr. England's plan that he accept the coadjutorship of Charleston Diocese. When the Haitian negotiations were taken from Propaganda's jurisdiction and placed under a special commission, Bishop England realized that he would be occupied

[3]Copies of this correspondence from America are now in the Irish College *Portfolio*. In 1895, the papers relating to the American Church in this valuable collection were transcribed by the archivist of the American Catholic Historical Society (Philadelphia) and are now in the archives of the Society. Many of these letters were published in the *Records* (Volumes VII, VIII, XV, etc.) and their value for American Church affairs is very high. It is deeply regrettable that our own bishops, who were in correspondence with Cardinal Cullen, with Bishop O'Connor of Pittsburgh, who was Vice-Rector of the Irish College in 1833, and with Monsignor Kirby, who succeeded Paul Cullen, had not the same historical sense of preserving the letters which came to them from Rome. The Archives of the Archbishop's House, Dublin, contain very little of the Cullen correspondence with the American bishops. I was informed on good authority that when Cardinal Moran went out to Sydney, Australia, in 1844, as Archbishop of that See, he took with him a great part of the Dublin archiepiscopal archives for the purpose of writing his uncle's (Cullen) life, and that repeated efforts to have these valuable documents returned to Dublin have not yet been successful.

with the concordat until the whole affair was completed to the satisfaction of the Holy See.

In July, 1834, in accordance with the method decreed by the American prelates at the Second Provincial Council, Dr. England wrote to the Archbishop of Baltimore and to the Suffragans stating that he intended proposing "the following three names to have one of them chosen as my substitute and successor in the Diocess of Charleston:

1. Rev. Paul Cullen, rector of the Irish College in Rome.
2. Rev. William Clancy, professor of the College of Carlow.
3. Rev. Patrick McSweeney, president of the Irish College, Paris."[4]

There is something that cannot be explained (no doubt because the letters are missing) in the selection of this *terna*. For years Dr. England in his correspondence with the other American bishops and with the officials of Propaganda had recommended his friend, Father John Power of New York, for the episcopate. Father Power was then one of the most prominent ecclesiastics in the American Church. He had been mentioned for several of the new Sees, and was considered by the clergy and laity of New York as the logical successor to Bishop Dubois when it became evident that New York needed a coadjutor. Father Power was the first to receive the honorary degree of Doctor of Divinity from Georgetown College, after that institution had been raised to a Pontifical University by Pope Gregory XVI (March 30, 1834).[5]

Dr. England did not, however, suggest his name for Charleston. On August 1, 1834, Bishop England wrote from Rome to Dr. Cullen, who was then in Ireland:

> Now for my own affairs. Nothing as yet is done though I believe all is prepared, and I am led to think it will be easy. Trezza was occupied with Bavarian business until about ten days since. I called on him, and after much talk I told him it would be impossible for me to mind Haiti and Charleston, and that in confidence I informed him that I wanted you as a Coadjutor. He asked whether I had your consent. I said that I

[4]Copy in the St. Louis Diocesan Chancery Archives (England to Rosati, Rome, July 22, 1834; another copy is in the BCA—Case 23—G-7). The Rev. Patrick Boyle, C.M., of the Irish College, Paris, writes to me (September 28, 1926) that there are no letters from Dr. England in the College Archives.

[5]Shea, *Memorial Volume etc.*, p. 106. Cf. *Cath. Misc.*, vol. XIII, p. 383.

had no doubt of obtaining it, if the Pope consented. Some days afterwards I asked for an audience, the second since your departure, and I told the Pope that I could not do what he wanted me to undertake unless he gave a Coadjutor. He said that if I wished one there would be no difficulty. I then said that without asking his answer at present, you were the person I looked for. He was evidently quite unprepared for this and changed his manner at once. He asked if you were aware of it. I said that I mentioned it to you more than once, and said that I would present your name, and that your answer was that you were in the hands of his Holiness and would do as he desired. I told him that I wanted no immediate answer but wished him to be prepared. We then spoke of other business. O'Connor was present. I have spoken of this to no one else except to Cardinal Lambruschini, which I told you before. But I have written to the American Bishops and to my own priests saying that I would ask for a Coadjutor, and would present the names of you, Clancy and McSweeny. This was on Monday, the 21st. Yesterday I had another audience and the Pope told me that Trezza had been with him on the previous evening, that he told him he had only added assent to what was done in the Propaganda, and that there would be no difficulty, as it was clear I should mind both places and have a Coadjutor. But I do not know of any day being yet named for the Congregation.

From this I conclude you will be named: for I have not been asked for any other name, and his Holiness spoke as if no question at all would arise upon the name. I thought it my duty to give you this information which I consider sufficient to shew you that, whatever might be the result in future days in your regard, at present God seems to have given me after a long struggle the prospect of seeing Charleston well sustained and my labours not in vain. Hence, without publishing at once your reasons, I think it would be prudent for you to take immediate steps for having this house provided for. O'Connor would, under certain circumstances which I think can be considered favourable, wish to join us. In any case I do not know that he would wish to stay here. We have conversed much and confidentially upon the subject. Yet for the present, his remaining might be of the greatest importance and necessity. I have great reason to think that O'Reilly would follow you . . . . It is natural that you should also now feel an interest in the Ursulines who will be accompanying me, and who are now only waiting my arrival. I wish you could be ready to go with us. Could you not commission some one here to send your books &c. by Leghorn? One thing is clear;

I shall be a prisoner to Charleston until your arrival, and I hope not to be kept from visiting Haiti until Spring, unless you, as you must now naturally be, are anxious to put me out of the way soon by throwing me upon Boyer's hospitality for the summer and giving me a West India grave.

* * * * * *

Saturday, August 2, twelve o'clock. I have just seen Monsignor Trezza who had conversation yesterday with the Pope, and now prepares to bring my business to a termination. He asked me whether I had your consent. I answered that you told me that you would do what the Pope desired, that I told you I would apply for your appointment, and that you left Rome leaving the matter in my hands and disposed to do what his Holiness thought proper. He then told me that the Pope would have no difficulty, and that I may consider the affair as terminated; merely the forms to be gone through with. How I do wish you could come out with the nuns and me. I beg of you to take whatever steps you can to make no unnecessary delay.[6]

On August 18, 1834, Dr. England wrote to Dr. Cullen informing him that the Pope had agreed to give him "Abbate Don Paola Cullen" as his coadjutor:

It would be more gratifying to you and to your friends here that you should be consecrated in this city, but it would be more gratifying to the priests and people of the Diocess of Charleston to see you consecrated amongst themselves, and would insure you the attachment and affection of them and of the great bulk of the population, were you to pay them this compliment. This single act on your part would place you, more than two years residence, as one of their own body, as identified with themselves and at once destroy the feeling of your being a stranger. One great object of the appointment was to enable me to proceed to Hayti at as early a period as possible. Should you return hither before going to the U. S. this will be in a great measure frustrated. For I cannot go to that island with any prospect of safety to myself, or ability to labour, except during the Winter. Hence unless I go in December, I could remain only a short time, or be exposed to serious danger by delaying in order to labour in the month of May and those which succeed it; or I must be idle during the Summer. But at present the people of Charleston, now upwards of two years without a bishop would feel greatly displeased at my departure without your presence. Discipline,

[6]Irish College *Portfolio*, p. 111.

which always requires the presence of a proper officer, would suffer materially; the *Miscellany* is already greatly fallen;—the Seminary needs the presence of one of us. And the Sisters of Mercy, the French Dames de la Retraite and other little institutions all want supervision and attention of an ordinary, or one having authority. One of us must necessarily therefore remain in the Diocess this next Winter and Spring. This is absolutely necessary. Unless you will do so, I must, and if I do, Hayti is abandoned for a year, as you could not well arrive for the Summer, nor if you did, could I so well go to labour during that season in Hayti: Thus, whether Hayti shall be attended to this year with a prospect of success, or abandoned for a year with serious danger of loss, depends upon your determination.

Should you come hither previous to your going to Charleston, you could not with your best exertions, arrive in the U. S. before the month of April. Though to a person habituated to the climate of Rome, the change to Charleston is comparatively of little moment, yet it would be far more convenient that you arrived there in November as you would thus gradually become better prepared for the Summer: but arriving in April you come just before the commencement of that season, and feel all the inconvenience of the change, and for me, it would be still a worse time to go within the tropics.

The Ursuline nuns will be altogether strangers, undertaking a large and a respectable institution: they cannot be abandoned —one of us must remain with them in the city of Charleston, altogether during the Winter and Spring.

This is indispensable. I could urge others, but I should hope the few reasons here given would suffice to show you the absolute necessity of your accompanying those ladies and me in October. I know that besides the indulgence of a very natural feeling, you will have some reasons of weight to set off against the above: but I am greatly in error if they will be anything like a counter balance.

I now propose to you to accompany the Ursulines and me, and during the voyage we can arrange everything with perfect facility, and we will be more happy in your society and you with us, than if we were to separate. As to expense: From this day out, whatever I have is equally at your use as at mine,—if you are not provided with means without settling your Roman accounts, I shall provide until they shall be settled. I want only yourself,—you need look to nothing. My trunk is yours. Your consecration could take place at Charleston with very great benefit and edification on the 30th of November. You would perhaps not object to my having the gratification of per-

forming the ceremony, aided by two of the following prelates: Doctor Portier of Mobile, Doctor Kenrick of Philadelphia and Doctor Eccleston, Coadjutor to the Archbishop, and to have Dr. Power of New York to preach on the occasion. Should you have strong reasons to dissent from this proposal, I shall of course fully acquiesce, and even yield to your feelings or wishes without requiring any reason. Still I should hope that you would find the above proposition not unreasonable. In the event of your acquiescing in this view: Did I survive: probably, I would return from Hayti to Charleston in May, and then, should you require it for the winding up of your affairs here. I should consider it reasonable that you should return, and probably in the course of six or seven months be able to do all you wanted in Rome and Ireland, and arrive in Charleston in full time to enable me to return, if necessary to Hayti for the succeeding Winter.

I have given you my views,—I shall do, what I recommend to you, pray to God to direct you for the best, and shall be satisfied with the determination you shall come to, and hope to meet you in Cork about the 30th of September. I shall write to the Archbishops of Ireland and think that you should lose no time in giving them the information.[7]

Dr. England wrote from Marseilles, (August 30, 1834) to "the Right Rev. Paul Cullen, Bishop-Elect of Oran":

Never were bulls expedited more quickly than yours. I made them at the Consulta work on a holiday and obliged them to do eight days work in eight hours:—I have the two briefs—one constituting you bishop of Oran (I suppose Oriense) *in partibus*. Mai and I wished to have it Maronia,—that upon your return to Rome, next April, you and Nick Farrell might have a repetition of the battle he had with McHale. I wrote requesting you would meet me in Cork about the 30th prox. I must beg to you to make it earlier, let it be from the 14th to the 18th, on one of which days I shall probably arrive, and try to sail, if no better way be found, by the Liverpool packet of October the 1st.

Without dictating to you, or depriving you of your perfect freedom of choice, I must inform you that the Holy Father very fully enters into the view I communicated to you of our departure together, and your being consecrated in Charleston and returning to Rome after Easter. He wishes much to see you, but says it is all important that I should go to Hayti this next Winter and that Charleston would have reason to com-

[7] *Seven Hills Magazine* (Dublin), vol. II, p. 41.

plain, if I went without leaving you. He moreover said that did he not consider our joint mission, for such it now must be considered, as of primary importance, he would not have appointed you, as he desired still to retain you in Rome for some time. You will consider the value of this and of the reasons I urged before and act accordingly. I must however tell you, that all your friends in Rome have made up their minds not to expect you until you arrive from America. Your answer must give the direction to my whole conduct and therefore I beg I might have it at the earliest moment. Should anything detain you even for two days, be good enough to write to me your decision, to the care of my brother, Rev. Thomas England, Cork.[8]

The brief for Dr. Cullen's appointment was prepared by Propaganda on August 22, 1834.[9] What induced him to decline the coadjutorship is not clear, but sometime between this date and September 11 he wrote to Dr. O'Connor, then Vice-Rector of the Irish College, to say that he was not desirous of accepting the Charleston post. This letter was shown to Gregory XVI by Dr. O'Connor, and in consequence Propaganda wrote to Dr. Cullen at Dublin, on September 11, stating that the Holy Father would not insist upon his promotion. Cullen was thus dispensed from obeying the Apostolic brief naming him Bishop of Orense, which would however remain in force until another priest was elected. Dr. England was informed at the same time by the Cardinal-Prefect of Cullen's change of mind.[10]

Before this news reached Dr. England, who was then in Cork, he wrote to the very Rev. Dr. Fitzgerald, President of Carlow College, on September 17, 1834.

As I know not whither to direct a letter to Doctor Cullen, and think it possible you might be able to convey to him the following information, I beg to transmit it through you.

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 45.

[9] Prop. Arch., *Lettere*, vol. 314, fol. 460. The *Miscellany* of October 25, 1834, carried the announcement of Dr. Cullen's appointment to Charleston. "Judging from the well known and highly appreciated merits of Dr. Cullen, we think that we have ample cause to congratulate the Catholics of this Diocess in obtaining an assistant Prelate of such piety and virtue as has throughout characterised the life of Doctor Cullen. We think, also, that we may tender our congratulations to the American Hierarchy, in the acquisition to their body of a Prelate of such distinguished talents and literary acquirements as he is known to possess in a superlative degree, and which have rendered him a particular favorite of the Holy See."

[10] *Ibid.*, Vol. 315, fol. 506.

I arrived here on Sunday, and have done all my business here and waited a day for the purpose of hearing from Dr. Cullen, to whom I wrote from Marseilles and who, I suppose, received my letter long before this. But my time presses so that I leave this city this evening for Liverpool, through Dublin, to procure passage for the nuns and myself, and for Dr. Cullen if he will accompany us.

I have left his Bulls as Bishop of Oran and my Coadjutor with my brother Edward in this city, who will give them upon application.

I have heard reports that Dr. C. declines. This I cannot believe after our conversation in Rome. But should I be mistaken I should wish to know as soon as possible that I might act accordingly. I shall probably stay in Liverpool but a day or two, and return by Dublin and Carlow, and sail as soon as possible—by the 1st of October if possible. I wish Dr. Cullen to write to me in Liverpool, care of Rev. F. Murphy, St. Patrick's Chapel.[11]

On September 19, 1834, Dr. England's letter from Dublin gives us the news of Cullen's change of mind:

I was quite unprepared for the reports which I find in circulation since my arrival in Ireland, of your declining the appointment to obtain which for you I had your acquiescence before you left Rome.

I should very much regret to find that those reports were well founded, because it would now irremediably throw back the Haytian mission at least a year, perhaps do irretrieveable injury to the cause of religion in that island:—as I have your Brief of appointment for the See of *Orense in partibus*, I believe, Oran, and that naming you my Coadjutor. They lie in the hands of my brother Edward in Cork waiting your directions. I cannot now have any change made, whereas had I when in Rome been apprised of such a determination on your part, I would have had a different appointment made.

This however should not weigh with you, to induce a disagreeable determination. I would more deeply regret forcing you to sacrifice either feelings or prospects to remedy an oversight. I shall feel most happy if you accept, but I shall still cherish my feelings of friendship and respect for you, should you decline.

I am however at present in a very unpleasant state from which I beg you will relieve me. I know not what you will determine, and therefore cannot act. My time presses, and I

[11]Irish College *Portfolio*, p. 113.

ask in vain either to find you or to hear from you. In my letter from Marseilles, I begged of you to write to me to Cork, if you did not come thither. I now am on my way to Liverpool, and hope to be in Dublin on Monday or Tuesday; in Carlow the day after, and then in Cork. I shall try to sail for the U. S. on or about the 1st of October. I beg of you then at once to release me from the very unpleasant state of suspense in which I am by saying whether you will or will not accept our nomination and accompany me. I would far prefer an interview to a letter. But let me have one or the other.[12]

A few days later, Dr. England received a message from Cullen that he had reconsidered his decision to go out to Charleston, and on September 24, 1834, Dr. England wrote to Cardinal Pedicini, from Cork:

I have just learned, not without sorrow and astonishment, from my friend Dr. Cullen that he is not of a mind to accept the coadjutorship of Charleston, to which the Holy Father has appointed him. I am returning to your Eminence the Bulls entrusted to me for him. I understand that he has given his motives for so doing, but I am unaware of these . . . .I hope to arrive in Philadelphia about November 15, but I cannot set out for Charleston until some one is sent to me to take Dr. Cullen's place . . . . Among the subjects for the coadjutorship is one who has been known to me from his earliest years, Father William Clancy. He is about thirty-eight years old, and was one of my pupils in the Seminary at Cork. After his ordination at Carlow, he laboured with great success in the Diocess of Cork, and then went to Carlow College, where he lives now, and there he has taught the humanities, philosophy, the oriental languages, and theology.[13]

Dr. England could not promise Father Clancy a home so attractive as the one he had in Carlow. If he accepted the coadjutorship, then Dr. England asked that Father Clancy's consent be sent to him at once in writing, and that he be consecrated as soon as possible and come to Charleston. The important thing was that no delay occur in Father Clancy's appointment, for upon his presence in Charleston depended Bishop England's freedom to attend to the Haitian negotiations. Before sailing, Bishop England wrote to Dr. O'Connor asking him to assure the Holy See that Father Clancy was in every way qualified for the post. Dr. England had

[12]*Seven Hills Magazine*, vol. II, p. 47.
[13]Prop. Arch., *Scritt. rifer., Amer. Cent.*, vol. 11, No. 7.

discussed the whole affair with Father Clancy, and the young clergyman was willing to accept the coadjutorship; although the nomination, he said, came at an inconvenient time for him. If the Holy See accepted Bishop England's assurances of Clancy's fitness, he could then be consecrated and reach Charleston in January or February, 1835, and Dr. England would thus be enabled to go to Haiti before the unpleasant hot season set in.

The Holy See acted promptly in accord with Dr. England's wishes. On October 28, 1834, the Secretary of Briefs was requested to change the name in the Bulls for the coadjutorship and to send the same to Father William Clancy, and on November 6, Bishop-Elect Clancy was addressed by Propaganda with his new title, and urged to arrange for his consecration at once.[14] That same day the Sacred Congregation wrote to Bishop England. It is not certain how the Irish hierarchy viewed Dr. Clancy's election; but in one of Father William Vincent Harold's letters (December 5, 1834) from Dublin we read: "I almost regret that our friend Clancy has accepted the Mitre of Charleston. With talent and knowledge and zeal and activity for that arduous office, I am sorry he has accepted it. He is too young and too fat to encounter that climate and the yellow fever which visits it annually. It has blanched one Bishop, and I rather fear it will kill another and a better."[15]

Bishop Clancy was consecrated at Carlow by Bishop Edward Nolan of Kildare-Leighlin, assisted by Archbishop Slattery and Bishop Kinsella, on December 21, 1834, and the news of his near arrival was given in the *Miscellany* for January 10, 1835.[16]

The disappointment did not cause Dr. England to break friendship with Dr. Cullen, though the tone of all his letters after this is an official one.

On January 1, 1835, Bishop Clancy wrote from St. Patrick's College, Carlow, to the Cardinal-Prefect; and as the first of his official letters with Rome, some paragraphs are interesting as indicative of his character: "Rarely, indeed, if ever", he writes, "since

---

[14]*Ibid., Lettere*, vol. 315, fol. 559, 564.

[15]Tallaght Archives.

[16]Bishop Nolan presented him with Dr. Doyle's mitre. Cf. *Cath. Misc.*, vol. XIV, pp. 222, 262, 310. The consecration sermon, containing statistics of the Charleston Diocese, could not be found in the Dublin libraries.

the time of the Apostles has it happened in the history of the Christian Church, that a Bishop has gone from his own land to a foreign country so destitute of money, goods, books, or vestments, as I. And this because of the following reasons: I have never had a parish nor have I enjoyed a patrimony or an ecclesiastical benefice . . . . I have no funds for the expenses attached to my office or for the journey to Charleston."[17] He trusted that the Holy Father would send him a subsidy, large enough to cover his expenses as well as those of sixteen promising candidates for the priesthood whom he had chosen for Charleston. One significant phrase escapes him in this letter. *"Omnibus notum est in Hibernia me ad Americanam regionem eundo non pro meliori sed pro longe pejori parte mutari."*

Cardinal Fransoni's answer is dated January 24, and is to the effect that Propaganda had spent so much for the missions during the year just past, that with all the good will possible in his case the Cardinals were unable to help him. Moreover, Fransoni believed that, since Dr. England and Charleston were profiting by Dr. Clancy's coadjutorship, the necessary subsidies should come from that quarter. Dr. England had received a grant of financial help between June, 1833 and November, 1834; the Holy Father had given him 2,000 scudi; the Sacred Congregation had sent him 200; and the Leopoldine Association had given him first 10,000 florins and then 6,000 florins. Recently, owing to the lack of money at Propaganda, the Vienna Society had given to Dr. England 3,000 florins for his journey to Haiti. Fransoni omits, he says, the other subsidies which Bishop England must have collected in various parts of Europe, particularly in Ireland.[18]

All this was somewhat unfair on Fransoni's part, for the files of Propaganda contained Dr. England's letter giving a detailed account of the expenditures of these sums. After he received the Cardinal's reply, Dr. Clancy replied (February 25, 1835):

> I thank your Eminence for the explanation, at once full and clear, sent to me, regarding the various sums of money in Dr. England's hands. Dr. Cullen told me recently of a cer-

[17]Prop. Arch., *Scritt. rifer., Amer. Cent.*, vol. 11, no. 2.

[18]Prop. Arch., *Lettere*, vol. 326, fol. 56. Fransoni added that, since President Boyer had met all the expenses of Dr. England's journey to Haiti, there should be sufficient funds in the Charleston Treasury.

tain contribution which the Pope and the Sacred Congregation had given to the Diocess of Charleston. Up to the receipt of your letter I had no knowledge of these financial matters connected with the diocess. Of course I had no right to this knowledge, but had I been aware of them, I would not have written as I did to the Sacred Congregation. I recently borrowed the sum of 1000 dollars (*solidos*) from a brother of Dr. England who lives in Cork. Up to this time no letters from Charleston have reached me, and so I am remaining here at the College, continuing my task as professor of theology, until I shall have collected enough money for my journey, and until I hear from Dr. England as regards the candidates for Charleston. I will follow your advice and accept none who can not pay their way. Some of my friends in the Irish priesthood are raising a purse for me, and so if it is successful it will not be detrimental to the Diocess of Charleston. I fear much, and several of our best physicians warn me also, that this southern diocess, where it is so warm and intolerable will be quickly hurtful to my eyesight, which is now rather poor. I tell this to your Eminence, and will give certificates for the fact if necessary, so that if in the future it may be necessary for me to ask for a transfer, no one may say that I am unreasonable in so doing or that I do so on account of the poverty of the place I am going to or on account of a lack of will to bear the heavy burdens of such a diocess.[19]

Meanwhile, Bishop England was waiting impatiently for the arrival of his coadjutor, in order to finish the Haitian negotiations. He had Dr. Clancy's promise to be in Charleston by the middle of February, 1835, but the coadjutor yielded to the importunities of his friends and remained in his post at the College. One of Bishop England's letters to Dr. O'Connor of the Irish College gives us a glimpse into the situation (February 25, 1835):

You perceive I am still here, and I will be so for some months to come. I know not whether Dr. Cullen has as yet returned to Rome. If he has, he can give you the cause, or you can see it upon the letter which covers this and which the good Monsignor Mai will have no objection to shew you.

After Dr. Cullen's refusal of his Bulls, I spoke to Dr. Clancy, who told me that he had many objections to leaving Ireland and going to America but that sooner than have me placed in difficulties, and the views of the Holy Father respecting Hayti disappointed, he would forego his objections, and if I thought

[19]Prop. Arch., *Scritt. rifer., Amer. Cent.*, vol. 11, no. 3.

him fit to aid me in Charleston, would come if appointed. I told him that if I sent his name I had no doubt the appointment would take place; and that he must calculate upon being ready to leave Ireland at the latest in December, so as to arrive in the end of January or the middle of February. For if I did not arrive in Hayti in the month of March I could not safely go thither until November, because of the fevers to which strangers are liable from May to November, and the impossibility of my travelling in this interval, owing to the climate and the want of accommodation. And I also stated that it would be impossible for me to leave Charleston before he should arrive there, as he could do no good without my instructions on the spot; and that he could not arrive with security in Charleston between May and November.

He told me he would be ready. I asked whether he would have money to bear his expenses and he said he feared he would not. I told him that I would speak to my brother Edward to advance what he might want and that I would repay it; that it would be expensive to be consecrated in Ireland, but that the priests and people in Charleston would be gratified at the ceremony, and it would be greatly beneficial to Religion, and the people would pay the expenses; that they would be more attached to him and he would be considered more as an American than as a stranger. All these reasons weighed with him and he assented. I then warned him that Dr. Nolan, Mr. Fitzgerald and others would endeavour to prevail upon him to get consecrated in Carlow, and I begged he would not consent. I came away and made all my arrangements upon this understanding.

I engaged a mulatto who was a sufficiently good classical scholar, and had excellent testimonials for piety and moral conduct and industry, to leave Ireland and meet me in New York, he would not be allowed by the laws of this State, on account of his colour, to enter its precincts, in order to accompany me to Hayti; as he wished much to be a clergyman; and I made other arrangements of a similar description.

Rome forwarded the necessary documents, and Dr. Clancy received them in the month of November, about the very day I told him they would arrive; and so far from coming off immediately he gets consecrated in Carlow when I had every preparation made here and the people delighted at the idea; when the performance would have brought hither bishops and priests who promised me their attendance, and given great satisfaction as well as raised our Religion highly in the public estimation. I never saw more mortification and disappointment than were manifested when the news arrived here.

Upon my arrival, nearly all the money I had was expended in providing passage &c. for three Ursuline Nuns, a postulant for the Choir, and two for lay sisters, as also for four who desired to join the Sisters of Mercy; and I calculated upon having the $1,500 allowed by Vienna and which it was said would be here upon my arrival. But judge of my disappointment. I found that I owed $1,600 to the merchants who managed my business for advances made by them to uphold my institutions. I found various small debts to at least an equal amount. I found the Churches and Seminary deeply involved, so that $7,000 would not pay the claims upon me, and all here under the impression that I was bringing at least $20,000 from Europe. I also found the sources of income deranged and the consequence of difficulties. I found a spirit of discontent and jealousy creeping in. The efforts of the Protestants against us were prodigious; our poor miserable churches wanted repairs, and one year more would have upset the Diocess. The *Miscellany* was neglected, and some of the priests looking for pretexts to retire. I set to work immediately to put things in the best order that I could. I had to write a better Rule for the Sisters of Mercy and to reconcile differences amongst them. The Ursulines had just arrived, and I had to sustain and place them. I had to restore discipline, and the heaviest and most difficult part,—to find the means of feeding and clothing those whom I had in the various places. Thank God I have done much. I had written to Boyer stating that I hoped to be with him in February, and had kind letters and little tokens of friendship for him from the Pope. I got an exceedingly kind answer telling me that I ought to know that I would be welcome. I had things so arranged as that, if I could borrow two or three thousand crowns, until I could get money from Europe, I could go to Hayti the moment Dr. Clancy should arrive. When lo! I get a letter that Dr. Nolan and Mr. Fitzgerald have insisted upon his staying for a few months. I wrote to him that by this he frustrated the object of his appointment and must account not to me but to his Holiness for having acted contrary to what we had agreed upon. This is to me a terrible disappointment, as I know it will be mortifying to the Holy Father who so readily made the arrangements. I could not with a safe conscience leave my Diocess this moment without a bishop; all that I have repaired would be ruined, and I could do little, if anything, at Hayti. Had I not been misled by Dr. Cullen's expression, which I looked upon to be an acquiescence, I would have been in Hayti in December last, and probably would have had things in some order by this. Had Dr. Clancy come when

he got his documents I should now have been there, and could do something before the great heats commence. Did I leave this, my own Diocess would be exposed to destruction, and I would arrive just in time to be exposed to the yellow fever of Port-au-Prince, which however would not prevent me from going, if otherwise I was at liberty, and during the summer I could do little, whereas I can now go on here to perfect what I have begun.

I write in haste as the Steamboat which takes this to New York leaves here in an hour, and I would not have so good an opportunity for the next fortnight.

Will you as quickly as possible make this communication known to the Holy Father, assuring him that, whatever has arisen to thwart his desires, nothing on my part has been omitted, nor shall my best efforts be wanting, to do all that I can to repair the evil which, without his fault or mine, has yet impeded the progress of this Haytian mission. The origin of this and many other evils is in the absence of any system by which the Propaganda and other places could be so fitted as to have always a provision of qualified and known missionaries for purposes like the present. It is quite annoying to see how far better the Protestants of this country with less means, organize systematically and are always prospered.

It would be useless for Dr. Clancy to relieve me before September at present. But it would be very useful if by some means I could be provided with pecuniary relief. Dr. Clancy wrote to Rome for money to bring out students. I do not want them. I have students enough, and in Ireland I could collect enough for my purposes if I was at liberty to make the effort.[20]

Dr. Clancy published at this time an account of the ceremony of his consecration with the sermon preached on that occasion, together with a history of the Diocese of Charleston, its great need of money and priests, and the necessity of assisting it on account of the increasing number of Irish emigrants who had settled there.

Propaganda lost no time in writing to Dr. Clancy, once it saw Bishop England's letter of February 25, that it was his duty to leave at once for Charleston. Cardinal Fransoni wrote at the same time (March 19, 1835) to Dr. England, advising him to overlook this delay and to receive his coadjutor cordially on his arrival. Rome realized that the negotiations with Haiti were being

[20]Irish College *Portfolio,* p. 116.

jeopardized by Clancy's actions.[21] On April 7, 1835, Dr. England wrote again to Dr. O'Connor:

> I have written to President Boyer, informing him that I was delayed for a short time by the non-arrival of my coadjutor, but that I hoped soon to have the pleasure of seeing him. I shall write soon again. Probably he has got my letter before this period. I have heard nothing further from or of Dr. Clancy. I have now to say that perhaps Providence prevented his arrival and my departure. At all events I had here an immensity to do; and had I gone, leaving things in the state from which I have nearly extricated them, I know of no one who could have managed them; and I never had to labour more intensely and incessantly. And had I been absent much longer, the evils which were covertly growing and strengthening would have exhibited themselves fearfully.[22]

Propaganda gave peremptory orders to Dr. Clancy on April 11, 1835, to leave at once for Charleston. He was not to worry about his health. The Cardinal-Prefect would not forget him in his prayers. Before this letter reached him Dr. Clancy wrote to Cardinal Fransoni (April 20) that, after months of waiting, he had just received a letter from Dr. England, filled with reproaches for his delay and lacking in fraternal charity. He says:

> I cannot understand why he should thus act towards me, now his equal, and formerly his friend, and who have done so much for him in writings and speeches and in money-matters, unless he wishes to induce me to resign the coadjutorship. He has sent me a verbose and rather acrimonious dissertation, filling nearly ten pages, on the necessity of American bishops being consecrated in that country—which, being obvious, did not concern me and for which he himself did not show the example. Towards the end of his letter he says he has entered a complaint against me with the Holy See. . . . . These are his own words: "I had your promise of acceptance and of setting out without delay after the reception of the Bulls, and I left in Ireland sufficient funds for your journey."

Dr. Clancy takes up these two statements and discusses them in a long letter which is filled with innuendoes about Dr. England's disregard for the truth:

> It is evident to me from his way of acting and from the tone of his letter that he had no desire for a coadjutor from

[21]Prop. Arch., *Lettere*, vol. 316, fol. 348, 387.
[22]Irish College *Portfolio*, p. 118.

> the beginning . . . . if there is any place (I do not mean a better one) where without contention, I can peacefully and fruitfully exercise the episcopal office, where the knowledge of philosophy and theology, and especially the facility of preaching in English, would redound to the glory of God, for I foresee that it will be very disagreeable for me to go to a diocess where I do not enjoy the absolute confidence of its bishop, then send me there. If, however, the Holy Father insists, I shall go, though with a heavy heart, this coming September, and I shall be prepared to suffer injury, hatred, ingratitude and all similar things for the name of Christ.[23]

In reply to Cardinal Fransoni's letter of April 11, telling him to leave at once for Charleston, Dr. Clancy replied on May 1, 1835: "I cannot forget the great sacrifice I have made, first for God, and then for the Roman Curia and the Bishop of Charleston, in freely exchanging my homeland, tranquility, my family and sufficient means of support, for a foreign country, hardships, long journeys, and poverty."[24] He intended to leave at once, however, and he directed the Cardinal to address him in all future letters at Charleston. Several commands sent to Dr. Clancy (May 1, 5 and 19) reached him before he left. In the last of these, Fransoni tells him that, the quicker he reaches Charleston, the better Propaganda would appreciate it.

Dr. Clancy did not depart until October, 1835. In a letter to Paul Cullen dated June 20, 1835, Bishop England writes:

> I never have had heavier labour or more assiduous application than since my return hither. In the midst of a thousand difficulties I have succeeded in putting the Diocess once more in order, and were I my own master, I should say that I ought not to leave it. Dr. Clancy has been atrociously misled by Andrew Fitzgerald and Dr. Nolan, and his delay in Ireland can never be repaired. I do not expect him before September or October.[25]

On June 24, Dr. England wrote to Fransoni that, on receiving the latter's letter of May 19, he wrote at once to Dr. Clancy, assuring him of a friendly welcome in Charleston. If, however, the coadjutorship weighed upon him too heavily, Dr. England would release

---

[23]Prop. Arch., *Scritt. rifer., Amer. Cent.*, vol. 11, no. 8.
[24]*Ibid.*, no. 9.
[25]Irish College *Portfolio*, p. 120.

him and Clancy would have his good wishes wherever the Holy See should place him.

When Dr. Clancy arrived in Charleston on November 12, 1835, Father Bermingham wrote from that city to Father James Wallace, congratulating the diocese on a prelate of such a distinguished bearing. "He is apparently well calculated to suit the habits of the American people", Bermingham wrote. Dr. Clancy found most of the priests of the diocese in retreat at the Seminary and from all, particularly from Dr. England, he received a hearty welcome. His arrival in this country gave pleasure also to those ecclesiastics who believed that the future of the Catholic Faith in the United States would depend very largely upon prelates of his race.[26] A few days later, in his address before the Twelfth South Carolina Convention, Bishop England said:

> I have already communicated to you the fact and the causes of the appointment of the respected prelate now associated with me in the administration of this Diocess. He has, upon the advice of friends, to whom he and I owe great deference, been consecrated in Ireland, and was detained there much longer than we expected by the discharge of duties in which we were not without concern, and by a heavy and protracted sickness, from which, thank God, he has fully recovered, and been given to our prayers in health and safety. You are already aware of the place which he holds in my estimation and affection; he will, I feel assured, soon possess a similar hold upon yours.[27]

At the close of the Convention the Delegates, cleric and lay, presented the following Address to Dr. Clancy:

> *Rt. Rev. Sir.*—It is not merely in accordance with ancient, and still continued usage, founded on the very best principles of our nature, and the genius of our holy religion but more from the conviction of our judgments and the impulse of our hearts, that we, the members of the House of the Clergy, and Lay Delegates of the Twelfth Convention of the Church of South Carolina, now in Session, take leave to address you on your arrival amongst us.
>
> With sentiments of gratulation we recognize you as the coadjutor of a prelate who for several years has administered the arduous duties of this extensive diocess, with that fidelity

[26]Cf. *Green Banner* (New York) for Nov. 7, 1835.
[27]*Cath. Misc.*, vol. XV, p. 162.

and devotedness, which has elicited not only the approbation of the clergy and laity under his immediate episcopal jurisdiction, but that of the American church, generally, and the admiration and approval of the Holy See.

We rejoice, not only at your being the coadjutor Bishop of this Diocess, but we hail with great gratification your accession to the American Hierarchy, to which apostolic and learned body you will be an ornament. Your merits, Right Reverend Sir, fully entitle you to this expression of our feelings. For years we have been fully acquainted with your character, not only as a man of science, of wisdom, and of exalted virtue, but as one deeply imbued with those feelings which are the most congenial to the institutions of this country, which you have in common with us, freely, and cheerfully chosen as the field of your future exertion in the vineyard of the Lord.

From the days of your infancy you have chosen the Lord for your inheritance—the priesthood was your only ambition. By him, whose co-adjutor you are now become, you, like many of those you find under his charge, were led to the rudiments of ecclesiastical science before you were placed in that seminary which had been his, and became your Alma Mater. Yes, Rt. Rev. Sir, the College of Carlow has given to Charleston its first Bishop, and not Maynooth as some publications in this country would insinuate, and how glad we are, that he, who has been chosen as his co-adjutor has also been modelled in the same fount of learning, virtue and patriotism. In that invaluable seminary you have spent the days of your youth, and many years of your manhood, in the former state, an assiduous student, having won golden honors by meritorious distinctions—in the latter, as one of its faculty by sitting for years in the professional chair of the most useful departments of ecclesiastical science.

Nor has your preparation for conducting our missions been only in the seclusion of the school. You have endured the toil of exertion—you have borne the heat of the day, and felt the damp of the night for years, as the patient, zealous, and unobtrusive missionary of the afflicted, the poor and the persecuted.—Nor have you come hither to gather an earthly recompence of honor, of wealth or of ease, but under privation and obloquy, to labor for a Heavenly treasury.

In a word, we hail your arrival amongst us, as the successor of an apostle, and look forth with confidence to your future usefulness in the wide spread range of this portion of the church of Christ, on another ground.

You have been nominated by the Holy See, as one worthy of being stamped with the episcopal dignity, and successor in the

administration of this diocess, to him who has been created its first Bishop—who has spent years of toil, of privation, and a variety of other difficulties in promoting the general good of our holy religion, and who, on various occasions has intimately identified himself with the genius and spirit of our republican institutions. By such a prelate were you recognized, and nominated as a fit and proper prelate to be elevated to the episcopal dignity, and the co-adjutor bishop in the see of Charleston—nor is this all.

It is an additional gratification, Right Rev. Sir, to those who address you, to reflect, that in this Diocess at present, some are engaged in the ministry, and others prosecuting their studies, who have imbibed from you the milk of early and useful knowledge; who testify to your worth, and rejoice at your episcopal appointment to govern that portion of the Church, in which they hope to spend their days and years, in efforts to promote, together with you, the honour and glory of God, and the general good of our common faith,—and in which honorable and meritorious occupations, they beseech the Father of mercies to preserve you many years.

ROBERT BROWNE,
President of the House of the Clergy.
M. D. O'REILY,
Secretary.
JOHN MCGRATH,
President Pro Tem. of the House of Lay-delegates.
LAURENCE RYAN,
Secretary.

After the above Address was read Bishop Clancy spoke as follows:—

Gentlemen—The affectionate, and complimentary address just read by the Rev. Mr. O'Neil on the part of the Catholic clergy and laity of the Charleston Diocess, fills my heart with gratitude, and adds a stimulus to the motives of duty, and inclination already existing in my mind, to promote your future spiritual welfare. It must be always grateful to a stranger to find his arrival in a foreign country hailed by any portion of its natives, and settlers, as a partial, or general blessing. It is peculiarly pleasing to me as a Christian Bishop to find the enlightened, and the virtuous of the Roman Catholic congregations consisting as they do of Americans, Irish, French, Italian, Spanish and other nations, expressing sentiments so edifying to religion, so conformable to reason, and so consistent with the usages of polite society. May I express

a strong hope, that the intercourse about to subsist between me and the flock entrusted to my superintendance during the absence of Bishop England will be spiritually and practically useful to both parties.

While we fearlessly defend our own principles, and hold ourselves ready to give a reason for the hope and the faith which is in us, whilst we compromise not a particle of faith, necessary discipline, or morality; let us however strive to strengthen rather than destroy the divine spirit of charity towards all who conscientiously dissent from us:—leaving to God the searcher of the heart, to pronounce judgment upon internal motives—fervently and frequently asking of the author of all good gifts, that the light of true faith may be extended to the entire human race. Let us preach, and pray, and practice according to the Scriptures, & ecclesiastical tradition; but let us not wantonly assail the practices, or opinions of other denominations. You are already sufficiently well acquainted with your obligations in this respect—no ignorance can be pleaded by the clergy or laity of this Diocess on religious, or social subjects:—for to them has been given a prelate powerful in words, who for fifteen years has rendered services of the most intellectual character to catholicity in America, and who has extended the fame of republican institutions by his letters and essays, throughout Europe, more than any other ecclesiastic, or layman however patriotic, or talented. If I can but build on the wide, and useful foundations he has laid down, if I can preserve what he has so heroically commenced in the midst of contradiction and poverty, if I can bring to maturity the seeds of evangelical usefulness which has been poured forth by his able pen and fluent tongue in the cities, and swamps of this extensive district, my reward will be probably in Heaven, and not inconsiderable even on earth in the testimony which a good conscience imparts to a faithful labourer in the vineyard of the Lord. . . . You say truly that I did not come in search of gold, or power. If I sought either I made an obvious mistake in consenting to become the coadjutor bishop of this See as there is a less share of either in this wilderness of a diocess than in any other portion of Christendom for a Roman Catholic ecclesiastic—duty, and not self-interest has brought me amongst you, and the same principle shall guide me through future time in the care of the souls entrusted to me in the Carolinas and Georgia—they being as dear to Heaven as the more numerous and powerful congregations in the West, or the North—all being equally purchased by the atoning blood of the Lord Jesus. . . . .

America has hitherto (with a few exceptions) exhibited an enviable example of practical toleration—she is and has been the refuge of the persecuted and afflicted of the older countries of Europe—her political attitude at present is a proud and lofty one—without a national debt—endless tracts of waste lands still unoccupied—a surplus revenue—a navy as numerous and efficient on the ocean as her local militia is on land—her star spangled banner commanding and receiving the respect due to a nation daily encreasing in wealth, population and civilization. As long as she preserves her present proud attitude by the firm and prompt exercise of her municipal and general laws so long will she be respected at home, and dreaded abroad—so long will every sincere christian wish her to go on and prosper, conquering not by fire or sword, or faggot, the unholy weapons of ancient tyranny, but to conquer morally and intellectually by belying all predictions of the enemies of freedom elsewhere who are anxiously expecting symptoms of internal disorders, and ultimate dissolution. From the days of the first Catholic Bishop of Baltimore down to the days of Dr. England, an American citizen who postulated for my appointment, no ecclesiastic of any creed wishes more prosperity to America (provided she be faithful to her constitutional trust, and protect individuals in the just exercise of their natural, social, and religious rights) than the coadjutor bishop of Charleston.[28]

On February 23, 1836, Dr. England wrote to Paul Cullen on the situation Bishop Clancy's delay had caused in the Haitian negotiations. Part of this letter is missing in the Irish College *Portfolio*, but the part touching Clancy begins:

The declarations I had made that he would be consecrated in this city, created the greatest disappointment. I now saw by the Irish papers, passages of which were copied into our daily prints, that Bishop Clancy was to remain in Ireland for a year, and to bring out a great number of students, priests and nuns to convert and instruct the Americans! I soon had letters from him nearly to this effect. . . . In the middle of November, my Coadjutor arrived, and at the time my clergy were with me in Retreat. One hour's conversation renewed all my confidence in Dr. Clancy, and developed to me the source of his mistakes. He was liked by the clergy and by the laity, and began quickly to perceive the absolute impossibility of understanding what is requisite for the American Missions without having served upon them.[29]

[28] *Ibid.*, p. 174.
[29] P. 252.

There is an interesting document in the Propaganda Archives belonging chronologically to this part of the year 1836 which contains a sort of general retrospect of the Catholic Church in the United States up to the time of its composition (March, 1836). It is from the pen of Bishop Bruté of Vincennes, and no doubt is part of the material that scholarly prelate gathered for his proposed "History of the Church" in this country. In summing up various readjustments that he believed necessary for the good of the Province of Baltimore, Dr. Bruté states that Dr. England should not be transferred. Rumor had it at this time that he was to be sent to New York as coadjutor to Bishop Dubois. Bruté believed that he should be kept in Charleston for two or three years, until the Constitution which he had given to that diocese be fully developed. If Dr. Clancy were to succeed now, the system Dr. England had built up would go to pieces. But in case the Holy See should decide to send Dr. England to New York, then someone else should be sent to Charleston, and Dr. Clancy should be sent to another See. There would be danger, however, if Dr. England were changed to New York or Philadelphia, that the laity of those cities would obtain a Constitution similar to that of Charleston, on account of its success. The inference is, that despite Dr. England's harmony with the laity of the Carolinas and Georgia, the other prelates, especially those of New York or Philadelphia, would not be willing to secure peace by means of such constitutional legislation. Richmond ought to be restored to the hierarchy, Dr. Bruté believed, and he urged that Paul Cullen be sent to that See on condition: "*ne Constitutionem introducat.*"[30]

Bishop Clancy spent his next three months in America in a Visitation of the diocese. Unfortunately there exists no records apart from a few jejune notices in the *Miscellany* of his labors. The style of many of its editorials at this time shows that Clancy was contributing his reflections on American ways to the paper.

Shortly after his return to Charleston, Dr. Clancy wrote to Cardinal Fransoni (April 10, 1836), stating that he had the unpleasant duty of informing the Sacred Congregation and the Holy Father that there was neither work enough nor support enough in the Dio-

[30]Prop. Arch., *Scritt. rifer., Amer. Cent.*, vol. 11, not folioed.

cese of Charleston for two bishops. While he was still young and had his health, he thought it would be better for the Holy Father to send him to some other diocese in America or Great Britain, and he hoped the transfer would be made as quickly as possible. Dr. Clancy's failure in the Haitian affairs had created a strained feeling between the two prelates. From a letter Dr. England sent the day before (April 9) to Paul Cullen, this disappointment is quite clear. A few days afterwards, Dr. England set out for Haiti, returning to Charleston on June 3. On June 24, he sailed in the *United States*, Captain Holdridge, for Liverpool. A month later (July 19), Dr. O'Connor, then stationed in a church at Cove, wrote to Paul Cullen, saying that they were expecting Bishop England and hoping that he would arrive quickly because his mother was dangerously ill with fever.[31]

The Sacred Congregation saw no reason for Dr. Clancy's transfer, and so informed him on July 2, 1836, "*Age igitur et spe translationis consequendae deposita, omnem curam impende ut in ista vineae Domini parte ministerio tuo utiliter fungaris, ad quam colendam ab Apostolica sede deputatus es*".[32] In a letter, dated November 23, 1836, to Paul Cullen, Dr. Clancy writes:

> I wrote on the 20th of this month to Cardinal Fransoni in answer to a letter of his to me, stating to him and the Sacred Congregation the inutility of having two Bishops in this wretched diocess; also proving to him that a desire of translation arose more on the part of Dr. England than on mine in the *first instance*. There is neither labor nor support here for one, much less for two, prelates. By a letter received from Bp. England, dated Rome, Sept. 22, he tells me that the Cardinal Prefect told him that, if I wished for a removal, I should find a place anxious or willing to receive me. This is rather *too bad between them*, that I should be sent on a voyage of discovery through the new and old world. If, in consequence of your intimacy with the Pope and authorities there, you can be of any use in forwarding my views, I shall feel obliged. I would prefer any diocess in America or Great Britain to my present connexion with Charleston. A Vicar-General would answer all the purposes connected with Haiti as well, perhaps better, so far as this diocess is concerned. A person writing

[31]Irish College *Portfolio*, p. 63.
[32]Prop. Arch., *Lettere*, vol. 317, fol. 567.

from Ireland mentioned your having written in a letter to Rev. Wm. O'Sullivan of Cork, that Bishop Dubois postulated for me. I should be glad to know *if this be true* as it would relieve me of the painful necessity of looking out on my own account, according to the singular view given to me by Bp. England. I should wish during life to give as little trouble to my friends as possible; but there are some occasions, and this is one, in which, unless a man acts firmly, he cannot expect the esteem of God or his fellow creatures. You may therefore tell the Cardinals that the sooner an appointment takes place, with the mutual consent of the Bp. of Charleston and myself (already given), the more deeply will I feel the paternal solicitude of Rome to meet the just wishes of one, who has been and is attached from principle, more than utility, to the Holy Roman Catholic Church in all its details of local and general discipline.

P. S. We had Asiatic cholera during September and October in Charleston; about 1200 cases,—400 deaths of blacks and 60 of whites—about 100 Roman Catholics died in the city and vicinity, thus thinning a congregation already miserably small. We had a few converts from the Protestant Church on their deathbeds. The Parsons of the different persuasions attended rather fearlessly throughout the pestilence, with a few exceptions. This was the first appearance of this awful disease here.[33]

In the midst of the cholera epidemic, Bishop Clancy published a *Pastoral* (September 13, 1836) which won for him and for his Church the heartfelt thanks of everybody in the distracted city of Charleston. The document is written in a masterly style and was successful in the effect he wished, to allay the anxiety which gripped the city. It is too long to quote in full, but one paragraph is worthy of reproduction here:

Let every citizen and stranger exhibit himself ready even at the peril of his life, to discharge the public duties which the local authorities may assign, in their respective wards. Let cordial co-operation be the honest boast and characteristic of every Carolinian. Let the acrimony and selfishness of party, or religious bickerings, cease during these days of tribulation, and forevermore (if possible). Let there be no discordance between Christians and Jews, or infidels. Let all act as one man in the common cause of suffering humanity. Let Catholics, Episcopalians, Methodists, Presbyterians, Universalists,

[33]Irish College *Portfolio*, p. 131.

Baptists, and all other denominations, learn even at the eleventh hour to look on each other as brethren of one common social family, and combine in the enviable occupation of doing mutual good, and avoiding all moral and physical evil. Let the olive branch of peace, toleration, and practical humanity be raised in every temple. Let the dovelike accents of divine charity be alone heard over the troubled waters of this pestilential deluge, again proclaiming the command of our Redeemer which has been so often heard, and so rarely practiced, "Love your enemies, do good to them that hate you, pray for them who persecute and calumniate you, that you may be the children of your father who is in Heaven, who maketh his sun to rise on the good and the bad, and raineth upon the just, and the unjust." We have, Brethren, moved among the dying and diseased in the old Country, and we most cheerfully add our individual testimony to the general scientific opinion that Cholera is not taken by contact with the persons of the living, or by cautiously visiting places said to be infected. But when the spirit has certainly fled from the tenement of clay—let there be neither wakes, nor funeral processions. Let the body be speedily, and decently interred after prayers for the dead. Besides the medical evidence regarding its non-contagiousness, a fact of most conclusive character came under our own observation. There are at least three thousand Catholic Priests in Ireland: during the raging of the disease, they attended at all hours of the night, and day in the hospitals, and private apartments of the sick, and we do not know of more than two or three individuals out of so large an ecclesiastical community who are supposed to have contracted disease in the actual discharge of their spiritual duties. It is a well known fact, that one Roman Catholic clergyman in the city of Dublin, resided for several months altogether in Grange Gorman hospital, where thousands have died, and that he left it in as good health as when he entered for the first time.[34]

Bishop Clancy wrote again to Cardinal Fransoni (November 20, 1836) acknowledging the Roman letter of July 2. He repeats the fact that there has been no change in his own mind regarding Charleston and blames Bishop England for reiterated intimations that he would be of no further service in the diocese. Dr. Clancy had decided that to remain would only plunge him further into debt. He saw no hope for the future of the Church in the Carolinas

[34] *Cath. Misc.*, vol. XVI, p. 86.

and Georgia. "There are", he wrote, "about 6,000 Catholics of every language and color, living here in these vast wildernesses, and amid pestilence. Among these the greater part belongs rather to the soul than to the body of the Church, since they do not practice their faith nor approach the Sacraments; nor are they generous towards the support of the Church." Eight or ten priests would be sufficient for the three States, and he saw no necessity of two bishops to rule them. Cardinal Fransoni replied on January 31, 1837, refusing to consider the question of a transfer. The Cardinal's answer hints that, if the want of money was the only serious cause for Dr. Clancy's desire to be changed, Dr. England would be written to that very day to give the coadjutor-Bishop of Charleston what was needed for a decent sustenance. Propaganda believed that Dr. England's journeys through Europe had netted him a very large amount of money, and that a share of this with Dr. Clancy would remove all complaints from that prelate's attitude towards his present post.[35]

A month later, Father Kuhr, who had come to Charleston to preach to the Germans, wrote to the Cardinal-Prefect (February 22, 1837) that Dr. England was heavily in debt, owing at least $24,000, and with little hope of meeting his obligations. "Dr. England is so poor", Kuhr wrote, "that he has no house of his own. The mornings and afternoons he does his work in an office in the Ursuline Convent, and he sleeps in a little house with four rooms, where his coadjutor and another priest also dwell. The conditions were so crowded that he himself told me he was glad to leave for Haiti.[36]

Dr. England arrived in New York City from Liverpool on December 30, 1836. He left in a few days for Charleston, reaching his episcopal city on January 11, 1837. While in New York, he was asked to preach in St. Patrick's Cathedral. A contemporary account of his sermon on the Rule of Faith states that he was then at the zenith of his powers as a pulpit orator:

> Besides a happy facility of expression, he inherits also from nature other essential qualities,—elevation of intellect, sound sense, solidity of judgment, a clear perception, great memory, clear and distinct utterance, and an air which commands re-

[35]Prop. Arch., *Lettere*, vol. 318, fol. 71, 73.
[36]Prop. Arch., *Scritt. rifer., Amer. Cent.*, vol. 12.

spect and sustains authority. The impressions fixed by the eloquent orator on his audience are a strong evidence of the mastery he possessed over his subject;—they proved the attainment of that thelogical knowledge so necessary to treat the word of God with dignity, and which directs to conclusion without fear or hesitancy. But along with this knowledge, without which it is a vain attempt to undertake the defense or proof of religion, he exhibited the evidence of the profound dialectician, combining clear and distinct arrangement with a chain of reasoning which captivates the mind, attaching it at the same time it subjugates. The succession of his proofs, their order and development, imparted throughout a new light even to the first ideas proposed at the commencement of the subject. His views were always fixed and concentrated. No deflection. But though severely logical, he did not restrict himself to dry and purely methodical discussion. There was an ardour infused into precision of thought, and an eloquent vehemence into soundness of reasoning. Evidently feeling his own conceptions, he imparted that soul and life to his dialectic skill which riveted the attention of his hearers. Every word came forth in the strength of a hale and vigorous elocution, carrying along with it the evidence of a convincing and animated zeal; and in every word there was a tone of Christianity and persuasion;—nothing of the affectation of mind, prudery of phrase, or coquetry of expression;—nothing of that hypocrisy of sentiment, so degrading to sacred subjects, and insulting to the word of God. He disdains that suffrage of frivolous or fashionable maxim which would set bounds to the independence of the apostolic man. His powers of controversy are of the first order,—his intellect clear, memory extensive, discernment sure, hence his mastery in directing inference, exposing opinions and doctrines, and refuting errors. Joined to this, there is the possession of knowledge which communicates strength to his own original ideas, nerve to this reasoning, and supplies those abundant and solid proofs derived from comparison of authorities. . . . We must omit allusion to one marked feature of his eloquent discourse, pleasing we are sure to our Protestant brethren;—there was not a word uttered that could offend,—every expression was tempered with charity.[37]

Before starting out on his last visit to Haiti (February 27, 1837), Dr. England wrote from New York to Archbishop Eccleston:

[37]Cited in the *Cath. Misc.*, vol. XVI, p. 231. Immediately after Dr. England's return, Bishop Clancy began writing to other American bishops to secure their support for his transfer to another diocese. Some of these letters are in the Catholic Archives of America, Notre Dame.

I arrived here on Saturday morning and found a small brig nearly ready for sea, and bound to Port-au-Prince whither, wind permitting, she will set sail tomorrow. My accounts from that island are of such a nature as to show me its most perilous condition, and my instructions from the Holy See such as to make it my first duty to try and save it if I can, but of which my hopes are very faint, hence, finding my obligation plain, however much against my own wishes, I was obliged to decide upon going in this vessel with very little prospect of being able to return to the council. You will have the goodness to accept this canonical excuse and make the same known to my brethren that they may see my absence will be the result of duty and not of negligence. Of course I can not profit of your complimentary request to preach at the opening of the solemnity.

Allow me now to explain a little to you my own position. I am required to go to Hayti with the ultimatum of his Holiness to some protracted negotiations with the President, who desires a concession which Rome cannot make. Should this be rejected, I immediately return and fall into my old position which I think the more likely result. Should the President accept the offer made by the Pope, I shall continue charged with the care of Hayti until it be somewhat organized and a hierarchy of some sort created, but I keep my place in the American hierarchy and divide my time as I see necessary and find convenient between my own Diocess and Hayti. But it is the determination of the Holy See and my own wish not to separate myself from the American church as the Pope declined accepting my offer of resigning my See and Hayti both together, that I may devote myself to another object. Whether I succeed or not then in Hayti I continue an American prelate and in charge of an American diocess, and I have no other prospect, though I had other views. Chiefly because my system was so little in harmony with the opinions of the majority of my brethren and I thought I could be more useful in another situation.

Now whatsoever be the result as respects Hayti, even if my Diocess were tomorrow free from my incumbency, I am convinced that nothing could be more mortifying to my coadjutor than to be continued there even as Bishop of Charleston. To me this is exceedingly painful. He suffers greatly from it, and I deeply regret having unintentionally placed him into so unpleasant a situation. We are the best friends, he is one of the best of men and has done his duty in full and faithful obedience to my directions. But as I do not wish to keep him unhappy I have signified to Rome our position and obtained

an assurance that when any opportunity should offer, he would be translated. He has my full concurrence then, without any fault of his or any unkind feeling to each other, but quite the contrary, to use all lawful means to procure such translation, and I think it right to put you in full possession of our situation that you should feel no embarrassment, should any opportunity offer.

Should he be translated, I can I think easily, should any circumstance render an appointment to Charleston necessary either as Ordinary or as Coadjutor, point out names that will satisfy my brethren, my people, and the Holy See, and be those I know who will be efficient.

Having thus far treated of my own position, I come to this city and Diocess. I suspect it will not be thought presumptuous in me to say that I have during several visits and some sojourns for a period of fifteen years had opportunities of knowing it better than most other prelates. I also know its people and several of its clergy, many of them intimately, and I know the secret history of its mismanagement better than probably it is suspected that I do. You cannot be unaware that in its worst days Philadelphia was never so miserably mismanaged by Doctor Conwell as this is and has been during a series of years. The difference is that Philadelphia was in a sounder and more healthy state, but one schism was glaring, and proper means were not used to terminate it. This Diocess is not so sound, and the germs of a most formidable schism are deeply fixing their roots, whilst they who are taking the very means to cause them to shoot out and grow up, either do not see or affect not to see them. I tremble for New York. I need not conceal my conviction notwithstanding the difference of opinion of one whom I respect, that Doctor Power ought to have been Bishop instead of Doctor Dubois. I knew in Ireland Doctor Power during twenty-five years, and I know how he stood, how he stands here, and how he has been treated, as also I know what he is. The present effort is to keep him out from succeeding upon a vacancy by filling the place with a coadjutor. This is the true meaning of the movement and you are greatly deceived if you have not been told that the people of New York know it, and are determined to resist it. Neither you nor I nor Power himself can change this determination. Are you then prepared to risk a schism of perhaps years' duration and the loss of so many thousands of souls merely to permit Doctor Dubois after his inefficient administration to have the satisfaction of shutting out Doctor Power from the chance of succeeding him? If I know you, you are not; you love religion and justice and peace too

much. See what you have to contend with. The almost unanimous opposition of the Catholics, the aid of vast numbers of respectable and wealthy Protestants who to my knowledge enter warmly into this question, the aid that will be cheerfully given by the host of our bitter enemies for the malicious love of throwing us into confusion. I know that more than a million Dollars would be contributed to produce and to retain a schism. The mysteries of Albany and of Nyack and others of which perhaps you know nothing will be unveiled. And I ask, are you prepared for this? My good and respected friend, I look to you as one who will put an end to the miserable system of trick and compromise and intrigue that has hitherto been the bane of the Church of your native land, and at the head of which, I for one, do not regret to see you. You know not the efforts which have been made with Levins and the means offered to be placed at his disposal and I now tell you that the most wealthy and respectable Protestants of this city as well as its principal Catholics have repeatedly applied to me to advise them how to aid him, and it is very difficult that I have sometimes restrained them. . . . I warn you then of the volcano which they are endeavouring to bring you to ignite. I repeat to you what I told them in Rome. Beware—Hesitate—Wait—Do not risk a schism. Doctor Dubois is just as fit this moment to be Bishop of New York as he was the day you nominated him. And if one mistake has been made, it would be a poor motive for perpetuating the mischief. If you will not or cannot appoint Doctor Power, have patience and let time at least produce more favorable circumstances. You will pardon me if in my confidence I have written indiscreetly. Doctor Power is not the ambitious man who would ruin the church to grasp a mitre. I know that he does not wish his juniors and strangers to be placed over him, but I also know that he is ready to join in promoting a good appointment to his own exclusion; but another question is, whether he could succeed in preventing a schism if some nomination that was thought to be good was made. I think his own would be the best, and if it cannot be made, I wish delay until there be less danger. You are at liberty to make all prudent use you please of what I have stated.[38]

That same day he sent a letter to Cardinal Fransoni, stating that he was to sail the following morning for Haiti, and giving Propaganda the true condition of Dr. Clancy's attitude:—

I must confess a second time to your Eminence that in

[38]BCA—Case 24—T3.

selecting my coadjutor I have greatly erred. Dr. Clancy, for his own good and for the peace of religion, should not be obliged to remain in Charleston, even though at my death or from any other cause, he should succeed me as Ordinary of Charleston. He is very acceptable to me, he is distinguished for his character, zeal, and piety, but in one year he has wrecked that whole constitutional system of Church government which it has taken me sixteen years to perfect.[39]

The two Charleston prelates were in Baltimore together for the Third Provincial Council (April 16-23, 1837).[40] Some days after the close of the Council (April 29), Dr. Clancy wrote from Baltimore to the Sacred Congregation urging the acceptance of his resignation as coadjutor to Dr. England. The Haitian negotiations were finished, and the Bishop of Charleston admitted that there would be no further utility in Dr. Clancy's remaining in that See. On May 2, 1837, Cardinal Fransoni replied to Dr. Clancy stating that upon reconsideration of his repeated requests to be transferred, the Holy Father, Pope Gregory XVI, had appointed him on April 2, Vicar-Apostolic of British Guiana, in South America, and he was asked to proceed to his new See as soon as possible. In announcing the new post to Dr. England, Cardinal Fransoni suggested as Dr. Clancy's successor in Charleston Father John Hynes, O.P., a native of Cork, who had been for a long time a missionary in the West Indies. Dr. Clancy informed Bishop England on June 27, from Sullivan's Island, of his translation to the new See. Dr. England replied as follows:

I have just now been favored with your Lordship's communication of this morning, in which you inform me of your appointment to the Vicariate of British Guiana; and consequently of your withdrawing from the coadjutorship of this Diocess.

Under other circumstances this would have been to me a painful communication, but as I am fully aware that you undertook the coadjutorship, not so much to gratify your own

---

[39]Prop. Arch., *Scritt. rifer., Amer. Cent.*, vol. 12, no. 1. Cf. *Records* (ACHS), vol. XIX, pp. 164-165.

[40]The *Catholic Miscellany* for July 1, 1837, comments on the curious fact that, though Dr. Clancy sat in the Provincial Council of Baltimore, he was not then, in fact, a member of the American hierarchy, for he had been named to Guiana a fortnight before the Council opened. Fransoni's letter reached him on June 26. The brief of appointment is in Prop. Arch., *Lettere,* vol. 318, fol. 398.

feelings as from motives, first of kindness and subsequently for a sense of duty; and that your present translation arose from your own suggestion to the Holy See that a different mission would, when it could conveniently be made, be more acceptable to yourself, I am pleased that the holy father has acceded to your wishes.

Allow me however, my lord, to express my full sense of your honorable views, and testimony of your zealous efforts to meet all my wishes in the administration of my diocess and in the fulfilment of that commission which you so kindly undertook and so well executed in Hayti when I was prevented by illness from going thither personally, to discharge the duties of my legation. Permit me to hope that though we shall be separated in the location of our ministry, we may continue united in the bonds of attachment.[41]

Bishop Clancy had not been honest in his methods, as is quite evident from Dr. England's letter to Fransoni, on October 2, 1837. The seals of the letter sent to Bishop England on May 2, from Rome, had been broken in Cork, and from this fact, together with others he had since learned, Dr. England became aware that the suggestion of Father Hynes as Clancy's successor originated in Cork, and he declined therefore to consider the proposition made by the Sacred Congregation. The meeting of the two men, Clancy and Hynes, in Cork later in the year is interesting from the part the latter was called upon to play in the scandal which ended Bishop Clancy's career.

Bishop England replied to Fransoni that a coadjutor-bishop was unnecessary at the time. His obedience in trying to regenerate the Haitian concordat for the Holy See had wrecked his own diocese. During his absence from Charleston for almost four years, evils of various kinds had crept in; and not the least of these was the desertion on the part of the young priests he had educated and supported during their seminary days. They had fled from the penury and hardships of the diocese, and Dr. England realized that he would need to begin his work all over again. He would need to eschew all other activities and give himself wholly to Charleston —"*quia tamquam pauperrima difficillimaque, mea tamen est.*"

[41] *Cath. Misc.*, vol. XVII, p. 6. Dr. England announced Clancy's transfer to the other suffragans on July 1, 1837 (Catholic Archives of America, Notre Dame).

Among the two million people of the three States under his jurisdiction, there were less than 7,000 Catholics, "*atque inter omnes pauperrimi ac despectissimi sumus.*" He had only one word to characterize the results of his action in having accepted the Haitian legation—*stultissime.*[42]

Dr. Clancy arrived in Cork on July 24, 1837, and began making preparations for his journey to Demerara. What occurred between himself and John Hynes, O.P., is not known with accuracy; but from one of the letters now preserved at Tallaght, it would appear that in spite of Father Hynes' election to the titular See of Zante and to the coadjutorship of the Archbishop of Nauplia (the Ordinary of the Ionian Islands), Bishop Clancy tried to induce him to go out to Demerara as his Vicar-General. Bishop Hynes wrote to Father John Ryan, O.P., of Philadelphia fame, from Rome (June 16, 1838), accusing Bishop Clancy of dishonesty and of having violated the laws of hospitality. Bishop Clancy had gone to Rome after his arrival in Ireland, to ask Propaganda to release him from his promise to go to Demerara, "but he has been forced to abide by his engagement. . . .He can never show his face in Rome again."

In public addresses after his return to Ireland, Dr. Clancy spoke rather bitterly of his experiences in America and criticized the American nation as a land of intolerance and bigotry. These utterances were repeated to Bishop Purcell, of Cincinnati, and when that prelate visited Ireland in the summer of 1838, at a public dinner given at Mallow in his honor, Dr. Purcell denied Bishop Clancy's strictures. Dr. Clancy replied by publishing in the *Leinster Independent* the pertinent paragraphs on anti-Catholicism from the *Pastoral* of the American Bishops of 1837, and a passage from Dr. England's address of May 26, 1838. He reiterates his charges that intolerance against Irish Catholics was so prevalent that the United States should be avoided by prospective immigrants:

> I solemnly appeal to every Bishop, Priest, and Layman, in Ireland: is America under *such present circumstances*, a country in which Catholics enjoy the "utmost favour and toleration"? Is it not a country against which justifiable

[42]Prop. Arch., *Scritt. rifer., Amer. Cent.*, vol. 12, no. 9.

prejudices ought to exist? . . . Are not strong feelings of religious animosity manifested towards Catholics there? Have I not proved my assertion by the most unexceptionable testimony? . . . even Dr. Purcell himself solemnly speaking with the representatives of the American Church in Provincial Council in Baltimore, and not as speaking to a vague after-dinner toast in Mallow? Under the strong conviction of acting according to the dictates of Christian practical charity and prudence, I have publicly dissuaded and will continue to dissuade Catholic Irishmen from unnecessarily emigrating to the United States, until they learn on equally numerous and credible testimony, that a general change has taken place in the Protestant Republican mind of the Union, which according to the above evidence is now so depraved as to tolerate flagrant and numerous abuses of reason, religion, and social order. The publication of those documents from the altars of Ireland may keep many of our people from encountering such physical, mental and moral desolations, in a country where the Catholics are only one million of the entire population, whilst the Protestants are fully fourteen millions. I respectfully request that the press of my native land will circulate the knowledge of such important facts and opinions for the information of the Irish people, and the just execration of all enlightened Protestants and Catholics of foreign nations.[43]

Dr. Clancy continued his crusade against the United States wherever he preached, until his departure for Demerara.

On October 11, 1838, he started out for British Guiana with several students, arriving at Georgetown on December 10, of that year. The total population of the colony was about 100,000, of which number 5,000 were Catholics. Two thousand Catholic immigrants came during his first year of residence. He had in his Vicariate eight priests, five from Ireland, one from Scotland, one from France, and one Maltese. An interesting account of the mission of British Guiana appeared in the January, 1839, number of the *Annals* of the Propagation of the Faith, written by Dr. Clancy and containing passages from a memorandum furnished to Cardinal Fransoni by Father Hynes, who had been a missionary there (in Georgetown) for a period of nine years. Father Hynes took offense at the publication of this memorandum, which was a confidential communication and which he feared would injure the Church in

[43]Cited in the *Cath. Misc.*, vol. XVIII, p. 148.

the eyes of the British Government, which was then considering his appointment to Corfu. "Should the publication" Father Hynes writes to John Ryan (July 20, 1839), "find its way to the West Indies, it would do incalculable mischief as bearing evidence of ingratitude and falsehood, and I should be set down as the author of both."[44]

Within three years Dr. Clancy's position in Demerara became untenable, owing to a variety of causes, not the least of which were charges of a moral nature against his household. In 1843, Bishop Hynes, who had been unable to obtain the protection of the British Government for his residence in Corfu, was appointed to supersede Dr. Clancy in Demerara and the latter was asked to resign. A law suit followed for the protection of the church property of British Guiana against sequestration by Dr. Clancy, and it was not until July, 1846, that Bishop Hynes succeeded in obtaining possession of the cathedral and the bishop's house. Dr. Clancy left that month for Ireland, accompanied by members of his family who had come out with him, and by Sister Mary Vincent, his cousin, the source of much of the scandal of these years. The story is told in detail in a letter from Dr. England's sister (Mother Mary Catherine), then Superioress of the North Presentation Convent, Cork, to Paul Cullen, dated February 27, 1843.[45]

Dr. Clancy was deposed from his episcopal office by the Holy See and died in Cork on June 19, 1847. He is buried in the Cathedral there.

---

[44]Tallaght Archives.

[45]*Ibid.*, Sister Mary Vincent left her convent without permission, to go with her cousin to Demerara for the purpose of founding a house of the Order at Georgetown. The letter is partially published in the *Records* (ACHS), vol. IX, pp. 13-20, and some of the Hynes correspondence, *ibid.*, pp. 20-29. The Tallaght Archives have considerable material on the unfortunate affair.

CHAPTER XXIX

The Letter To The Society of Lyons

(1836)

In the eighty odd years that have passed since John England's death, almost all the principal episodes of his life have been dimmed in the memory of American Catholics except one, his share in the controversy which seldom fails to arouse discussion: the loss and gain problem in the Church of the United States. From 1836, when he embodied his ideas on the problem in his much-debated *Letter* to Lyons, to the present time, he has had few to support him in his belief that owing to sundry causes the Catholic Church had lost up to that time three and three-quarter millions of its children in this country. On the contrary, the studies which have been made since Dr. England's day in this vexed question have practically put aside his conclusions as untenable.[1]

Forty years later the loss and gain problem was treated in a popular way by O'Kane Murray in his *History of the Catholic Church in the United States* (1875). Murray bases his statistics upon the figures given by Bishop England, but he was able to give a brighter side to the picture by the number of conversions to the Church in the century that had passed since Independence (1776-1876). Occasionally, both before and after Murray's day, the question of Catholic losses was discussed in the Catholic periodical press, but no effort was made before the time of John Gilmary Shea to approach the problem from the sources. Shea does not treat the question in his published *History*, although there are many letters and memoranda in his papers which show that he was preparing to discuss it exhaustively. His death occurred at a time

---

[1]Cf. Shaughnessy, *Has the Immigrant Kept the Faith?* Chapter XIV (*Alleged Catholic Losses*). New York, 1926. Dr. Shaughnessy claims that Bishop England's entire statement "is a network of hazy and rash assumptions", capped by an egregious error which assumed that there was an immigration of 8,000,000 during the fifty years previous to his Lyons Letter (1776-1836). "His allegation may be said to be completely discredited today" (*ibid.*, p. 231).

(1892) when his judgment on the problem would have been very valuable to students of Catholic American history, for the so-called *Lucerne Memorial*, written by Peter Paul Cahensly in 1891, had not only reopened the old controversy in Catholic ranks but aroused bitter contention between the two dominant racial elements in the Church here at that period.[2]

The *Lucerne Memorial* stated our losses as 16,000,000. When the discussion was at its height, Mr. Cahensly presented a second *Memorial* to the Holy See (1910), in which the losses were estimated at over 10,000,000. This *Memorial* was published in 1912 and was first answered by Archbishop Canevin in a pamphlet entitled *An Historical and Statistical Examination into the Losses and Gains of the Catholic Church in the United States from 1790 to 1910.* Dr. Canevin writes:

> There have been so many conflicting statements about the leakage and losses of the Catholic Church in this country, that a careful inquiry into the historical facts and statistical proofs, on which such statements are based, ought to be made in the interest of truth and for the vindication of the zealous priests and devoted Catholic people who have preceded us in the way of faith, laying in poverty and sacrifice the foundations of the Catholic Church in this country. Can it be that these dark and gloomy recitals of leakage and losses have been made without definite knowledge or thorough investigation of the facts? Some of the writers and lecturers have placed the losses of immigrants and their descendants so far above what the highest possible natural increase of Catholics by birth and the total number of foreign-born persons in the country would warrant, that they may be set aside as exaggerated and unreliable calculations. It is evident, from all statistics at hand, that in the early missionary period there were not many Catholics lost to the faith, for the reason that there were not many Catholics in the country to lose; and that, in the most trying periods, the Catholic movement was steadily onward by fidelity in faith and conversions, rather than backward by leakage. . . . A thorough examination of the baptismal registers of the first half of the nineteenth century would show a large number of converts received into the Church, a number much larger perhaps in proportion to

[2]Cf. *The Progress of the Church in the United States from the first Provincial Council to the third Plenary Council of Baltimore,* in the *Amer. Cath. Quarterly Review,* for July, 1884.

the Catholic population than the number of converts at the present day. But it is not proposed to deal, in this pamphlet, with gains to the Church by conversions, but with the losses from direct apostacy and other causes. That there have been losses, all must admit; for men have fallen from truth and grace in every period of the history of Christianity; but has it been proven that the defections from the Church in the United States have been so extensive as to be reckoned by millions?

On October 28, 1912, Archbishops Ireland, Glennon, and Messmer, acting upon a resolution passed in the Annual Meeting of the Archbishops in 1911, sent out an appeal to the hierarchy of the United States for the creation of a fund to study the problem:—

> The question of *losses and gains* in the Catholic population of the United States from early to present times has been frequently under discussion in newspapers and other periodicals, both home and foreign, without, however, having been subjected at any time to such deep and searching inquiry as to yield an answer wearing more or less the aspect of finality and definitely giving to history the absolute facts in the case—whether these be what we should have wished or what we should have dreaded to discover.
>
> It is only too well known that statements have been made, telling of enormous "losses" to the Church in the United States during the nineteenth century, especially in the first half of that period of time. The statements are that those "losses" sum up to such figures as twenty or even forty millions. A most deplorable incident this were in our history if facts were there to justify such statements. A cause it were of humiliation and discouragement to American Catholics to have to believe either that heretofore the Church in America has been unable to cope successfully with difficulties crossing its pathway, or that, for one reason or another, the Church was not, and consequently is not, destined to live and thrive amid American institutions. What is no less unfortunate, the statements made at home have been repeated abroad, to the great discredit of America and of Catholicism in America: and more than once, have they been brought to the attention of authorities in Rome, with the express purpose in mind of proving that grave deficiencies exist either in the religious zeal of American Catholics, lay and cleric, or in the methods made use of in the ministrations and government of the Church in America. One year ago there was printed in Rome a *Memoire*, addressed to His Holiness, Pius X, and to their

Eminences, the Cardinals, most depreciatory of the Church in the United States. With regard to the question of "losses", the anonymous author of the *Memoire* has this to say: "European or American admirers of American institutions have been in the habit of extolling the progress of Catholicism in the United States. . . . He who is familiar with the true history of that country must tell another story, and confess in sadness that there millions have lost the faith. . . . Of the descendants of immigrants from Ireland more than fourteen millions have been lost to the Catholic faith. . . . To those we must add losses among the descendants of immigrants from German and Flemish lands." That the statements of the Roman *Memoire,* which, let it be said, are little less than a repetition of figures often given by writers and lecturers in our own country, are gross exaggerations, we have good and substantial reasons to believe. To quote but one argument to the contrary, we refer to the booklet recently published by the Bishop of Pittsburgh, Rt. Rev. J. F. Canevin, in which, from an examination of the records of immigration during the nineteenth century, the Bishop concludes, that by no valid stretch of figures could the descendants of Catholic immigrants be made to appear much more numerous than what is recognized as the actual Catholic population of the United States. This being the case, is it not the duty of present day Catholics to assist as they may so that by recourse to all available sources a thorough and extensive examination be made as to "losses" during the nineteenth century? Should it not be said: Let the facts be known, in the fullness of truth, so far at least as facts are ascertainable. If our "losses" are found to have been grossly exaggerated, let calumny be silenced once forever. If a measure of "losses" must be admitted let us know where lies the fault. Is the fault in the lack of intelligent zeal on the part of the Church in America, or is it in the moral and religious conditions of European immigration before it reaches our shores? If, all things said, fault in a degree is to be attributed to the purposes and methods of Catholicism in America, let the fault be brought home to all concerned, in order that efficient remedies be put into action to preserve the future from the evils of the past.

Two years later (February 17, 1914), the Commission, which then consisted of seven members, the Archbishops of St. Paul, Milwaukee, St. Louis and Dubuque, and the Bishops of Providence, Pittsburgh, and Des Moines, met at Dubuque, in order to adopt final plans for the execution of the project entrusted to them. This work

has continued since that date and a considerable number of original documents has been collected from all parts of the world in preparation for an actual study of the problem.

One member of the Commission, Archbishop Canevin, published in the *Catholic Historical Review* for January, 1917, a restatement of the problem and expressed a view which may be said to be the general attitude towards the question:

> No body of Catholics in history approached to anything like the marvelous progress which this poverty-stricken, hard-working, unlettered, persecuted, Catholic minority in the United States made between 1800 and 1900. Churches, schools, colleges and universities have sprung up all over the land; institutions of mercy and charity are there to testify to the love of these people for their fellow-man. There could not have been defections and apostasies of millions of Catholics, and at the same time a material and earthly progress of religious institutions and a Catholic virility that have not been surpassed in any nation or in any age. The stalwart faith and loyalty and piety of the Catholics of this country today, their unity and devotion to the Vicar of Christ, the position of the Church in the United States, prove that, amid the conflicts of the nineteenth century, faith and fidelity supported and sanctified the lives and work of those who preceded us, and ought to determine us not to accept without proof the statements of prejudiced minds that the Church has failed in this republic; that our losses have been greater than our gains, especially when we consider that our mission to those outside the fold and gains by conversion have been as great, if not greater, during the last one hundred years than in any country of Europe.

John England has no enviable place, therefore, in the history of the loss and gain problem. The late Bishop O'Gorman, in his *History of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States* (1907), wrote: "There has been much wild writing, about the losses of the Church in this country. Bishop England whiling away his time on board ship at guessing the Catholic losses in his day, without statistics or references at hand" set down the losses in his own diocese at 38,000 and in the country at large as three and a quarter millions from 1786 to 1836. "He assumed that in fifty years there had come into the United States eight millions of immigrants. This assumption, which is the basis of his calculation and argu-

ment, is absolutely without foundation." Dr. O'Gorman shows from generally accepted authorities on immigration that the total number of newcomers into the United States from 1789 to 1835 was 514,159. "Bishop England's opinion, therefore, as to our losses in his time may be set aside." O'Gorman then discusses the problem from the standpoint of the census statistics, and finds in the period covered by Bishop England's *Letter* (1776-1836) that not only were the losses inconsiderable but that these can be explained through causes finding their origin in the Church of the lands from which the emigrants came.[3]

The purpose of this chapter is not to enter upon a discussion of the controversy over our alleged losses and gains, even within the half-century covered by Dr. England's *Letter*. What is of value to our present narrative is to interpret in terms of his arguments and conclusions the views he expresses upon the progress of Catholicism in this country up to the time he wrote the *Letter*.

While in Lyons, in the summer of 1836, Dr. England received from the Secretary of the Society for the Propagation of the Faith a letter, proposing to him to prepare an essay for the *Annales* answering four questions on Catholic life and progress in the United States. On three previous occasions (1832, 1833, and 1834), Dr. England had remained for a time in Lyons to discuss with the officers of the Society the best method of assisting the American bishops. At this last visit, in August, 1836, he found the Society's officers much disturbed over the question "whether the Catholic Church had really gained by the emigration to the United States from the Catholic countries of Europe." It was not the first time the problem had been brought to Dr. England's attention by the Society. In fact, he confesses that for some years he had had doubts on the subject, owing to "the remarks made by a clergyman in Switzerland, I believe in Fribourg, I think a Mr. O'Mahony, not Irish but evidently of Irish descent, who contended strenuously that, so far from gaining in the United States any solid accession to her struggle, the Church lost many millions by emi-

[3]Pp. 489-490.

gration."[4] In his conversations at Lyons in August, 1836, Dr. England agreed that "there was no question but that there was an actual increase of Catholics, and of religious institutes; but we could not come to a satisfactory conclusion as to whether there was a gain or a loss, upon a full view of all the results by emigration."[5]

He left Lyons on August 20, at daybreak. Taking the steamer down the Rhone to Avignon, "I took out my letter," he says, "and read it. I found it to contain a request, that I would give the Council such information as I could, upon the important subject to which they had drawn my attention; and it placed the whole subject upon which information was sought under the extent of four questions." This letter has not been found, and no copy apparently exists in the archives of the Society. From Dr. England's answers, however, it is evident that what the Council wished was information on the number and geographical location of the Catholics in this country, the hindrances to Catholic progress, and the remedies to be applied for an increase of Catholic life and activity in the United States. From Avignon, Dr. England proceeded to Marseilles, and thence to Leghorn, where he took the stage-coach to Rome. It is clear from his correspondence that he was too preoccupied with the Haitian negotiations to while away his time on shipboard from Avignon to Leghorn, as O'Gorman says, "guessing the Catholic losses in his day". As soon as his report on the Haitian situation had been presented, he set to work, while in Rome, to answer the four questions proposed by the Lyons officials.

The original *Letter* was finished on September 29, 1836, and sent to Lyons, but was not published in the *Annales* until March, 1838, where it occupies thirty-three pages of that issue. The original was in English and was translated by the Lyons bureau. This English original was brought back to Charleston, was enlarged to over twice its length and then published in the *Catholic Miscellany* during January, February, and March, 1839. This longer *Letter*,

---

[4] *Cath. Misc.*, vol. XVIII, p. 241. It would appear that Father O'Mahony had raised this question about 1827. Was this "Father Prout"? He was at Fribourg at this time. Dr. England would have known of this eccentric Irish genius, since he was born in Cork in 1804.

[5] *Works* (Messmer), vol. IV, p. 259.

as it appeared in the *Miscellany*, was sent to Fathers Meyler and Yore, the Vicars-General of Dublin, for insertion in their *Annals*, and it is this *Letter* which is published in his *Works*.

This longer *Letter* is the one analyzed here. It is important to remember this fact since Dr. England was able to re-write his *Letter* from the available sources and statistics he lacked while in Europe.

Dr. England intended following up the publication of his document with one or two others which were to contain detailed statistics on the question of losses in the Church here. These were never completed. He was obliged to visit Europe in 1840-41, and his death prevented him from carrying out his plan of studying the whole problem in a more profound way. It is evident also in comparing the second *Letter* with the one which appeared originally in the *Annales* that Dr. England had taken serious cognizance of the criticisms made upon his study of the loss and gain problem. There is, for example, in the introductory part of the longer *Letter*, the following paragraph which has been added: "I am led, after much reflection, to enter much more at large into the subject, than was my original intention; and in the details which I give, and the views that I take, several friends for whom I have the highest esteem may not fully concur; but I consider it to be my duty to write as I think, and should I make any erroneous statement, to give the opportunity for its correction; and if my views be erroneous, I beg of my friends to set me right."[6]

He expresses the opinion that, not only in Europe but in the United States as well, very delusive fancies were being entertained of the progress of the Church in the Union. "I have no doubt upon my mind that, within fifty years, millions have been lost to the Catholic Church in the United States." He did not believe that the fact had been sufficiently brought to the notice of churchmen both at home and abroad; and he asserts that "proper remedies" had never been applied "to correct this evil". Naturally, in a public letter, he did not wish to blame anyone nor to criticize the methods used to spread the Faith by those of whose zeal and devotion there could be no question. But over one fact he has no hesitation: to

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 261.

anyone who for a moment calmly considered the statements of the letter he had received from the Lyons officials "nothing can be more plain than that, instead of an increase of the members naturally belonging to the Catholic Church in the United States, there has been actually a serious loss."

The question was not whether the number of Catholics had actually increased. No one could doubt that. One had but to look to the cities, towns, and country districts, and everywhere there was "the strongest and most irrefragable evidence of accession of numbers in thousands who rise up before you." The number of churches had increased. Priests were far more numerous. Colleges, monasteries, schools, printing presses, and Catholic books had multiplied. He did not wish to say, therefore, that the number of Catholics in 1836 was less than it was fifty years before; nor even as small as it was five years before. But he did assert the thesis that the loss of numbers to the Catholic Church had been exceeding great, "when we take into account the Catholic population at the time of the American Revolution, the acquisition of territory previously occupied by Catholics, the arrivals of Catholic emigrants, and the conversions to the Catholic Religion."

Dr. England's thesis stands or falls with his statement: *Fifty years ago the population of the United States was three millions; today it is fifteen millions. I shall suppose the actual increase of the original three to give us seven millions of our present numbers; this will leave us eight millions of emigrants and their descendants, together with those obtained by the acquisition of Louisiana and Florida.*

Of these eight millions, acquired by immigration and by cession, Dr. England estimates at least one-half to have been Catholics. Without any loss, then, he concludes that there should be at that time (1836) five million Catholics in the United States. There were actually in 1836 less than a million and a quarter. The loss, therefore, he places as three millions and three quarters at least, or thrice the number of Catholics known to the bishops and priests of the Church here.[7]

---

[7]Shaughnessy says: "Bishop England convicts himself here on two counts. He is guilty of very unscientific procedure in venturing, without statistics,

The remainder of Dr. England's long *Letter* is devoted to a discussion of the causes for this leakage. "Upon every view which I can take of this subject," he says, "and during several years I have endeavoured to examine it very closely, I have been led, in a variety of places at several epochs, to special details which have been partial causes of this great and long-lasting evil; but however these several causes may seem to differ, and under what peculiar circumstances soever they may have arisen, I consider they may generally be reduced to one great head: *The absence of a clergy sufficiently numerous and properly qualified for the missions of the United States.*"

Before proceeding to the proof of this statement, Dr. England makes the following significant accusation against the hierarchies of foreign lands, in order, as he says, "to unmask one of the most fatal errors that I have observed on this subject":

> The mind of Europe has been led to undervalue the nature of the American institutions, and to look upon the society of the United States as considerably under the standard of that in Europe. So far as religion, and especially the ministry, is concerned, this mistake has not seldom led to very pernicious results. Frequently in companies, where upon most other topics I could receive great accessions to my little stock of knowledge, I have been led to doubt whether I heard correctly the very strange questions that were addressed to me respecting our laws, our manners, our society, our institutions, and our habits; I was frequently obliged to avoid enlarging upon the topics, and more than once to evade the questions, upon the very painful conviction that it would be worse than useless to give information to those who were determined not to believe. They could very readily admit all that I chose to say about Indians, huts, lakes, wild beasts, serpents, assaults, murders, and escapes, but it was out of the question that my assertions would be equally well received if I insinuated that anything in legislation, manufactures, literature, or the polish of society was comparable to even what was ordinary at this side of the Atlantic. In fact it would seem as if a century had

upon a discussion which, as he himself states, requires precise details. He fostered a very serious charge against the American Church (although perhaps it did not appear to him in that light), without having first verified it. There is no question whatsoever but that subjectively he was exculpated; objectively, however, he committed a most unfortunate blunder, the effects of which are apparent in practically all chronicles and histories of the American Church". *Op. cit.*, p. 227.

> rolled away, and left America and Europe in precisely the same relative positions as to improvement, as they were when the first European adventurers undertook to stem the torrent of the Mississippi, making a tedious and exhausting effort to overcome, in six months, the obstacles of a voyage which now is little more than an excursion of a few days in a steamboat. *The result of this notion was that anything was good enough for America; and the Catholic Church has frequently felt the effects of this mistake.* It has more than once happened that men with acquirements and manners scarcely fit for Indians, have been deemed fit for any part of this region of Indians, and were thus inconsiderately sent into the midst of a community at least equally intelligent, and penetrating, and inquiring as any in the world.[8]

Dr. England sent the enlarged *Letter* to Dublin in January, 1839, hoping that the officers of the Society for the Propagation of the Faith which had been just founded in that city, would publish it in their *Annals*. He had especially the Irish bishops in mind, and he writes from the experience of nearly twenty years in the American episcopate. During the first decades of American Catholic life it can not be held that the Irish hierarchy showed any anxiety to protect the young Church of the United States from the evil of unworthy priests. This does not mean that our dioceses did not receive from Ireland men of splendid character, men like John McEncroe, who left behind him in Charleston and in Australia a record for apostolic zeal worthy of the early days of the Church. We have already seen how the Sacred Congregation de Propaganda Fide was forced to appeal to the Irish hierarchy to put a stop to this unholy traffic. Dr. England has more than unpriestly conduct in mind. He refers to the lack of zeal, the absence of a divine spirit of self-sacrifice, the worldly caution which ruled so many of those whom he had accepted from Ireland both as students and as priests into his own diocese. He has in mind also the fact that clergymen from France remained so patently French in their manners, their customs, their outlook, and their speech, that they gave to the American Church a foreign cast which at times he believed had its share in creating the anti-Catholic spirit of the day.

---

[8] *Works* (Messmer), vol. IV, pp. 263-264.

The main part of the *Letter* which now follows is devoted to an historical sketch of the rise and progress of the Catholic Faith in the United States from the standpoint of Dr. England's thesis. He divides the country into three distinct parts: "First, those places which were under Protestant dominion from the time of their discovery until the period of the American Revolution. Secondly, those places which had, up to that period, been chiefly, if not altogether, under the dominion of Catholic powers. And thirdly, that great region to the west of Missouri and the lakes, which was, and in a great measure still is, the wild domain of the Indian, who knows little of either."

The first portion includes the New England States, the Middle States, the Southern States, together with Ohio, Kentucky, Tennessee, and the greater part of Alabama. The second portion embraces Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, Arkansas, part of Michigan (including Wisconsin and Iowa), Louisiana, Mississippi, Florida, and a part of Alabama. "It is unnecessary," he says, "for my present purpose, to notice the immense range of territory which stretches off westward from these States, and which forms the third division."

The first portion was settled originally by the English and the Dutch. The second by France and Spain. In the second portion, progress had been hindered by the ecclesiastical policy of France, namely, not to permit the establishment of bishoprics,

> in order not to embarrass the governor by creating so high a dignitary as a bishop and who should necessarily receive the great attention which such officers are known to pay to prelates; and not to expose bishops to the indignity that might be the consequences of any neglect of the superior colonial officers, should it be possible that any of them could so far forget what was due to religion, as to be wanting in civility to the bishop. It is not my business to canvass the value of the reason alleged; but I feel quite at liberty to observe that the natural consequence of this palpable departure from the policy established by our Saviour and acted upon by the Apostles has generally been the destruction of discipline amongst at least the secular clergy who were affected thereby: and if we are to believe one-fourth of what is generally credited respecting that discipline in the French colonies previous to 1790, this statement would be fully sustained.

Spain had not "that semblance of respect for the episcopal char-

acter, which would prevent her having bishops established in her colonies." They were necessarily few, and resident far distant one from another. Numbers of them were excellent prelates, but there had been too many whose promotion was due to political reasons. In the French and Spanish colonies "priests that would not be tolerated in the mother country forced their way into places for which they were by no means qualified." In Spanish Florida, Dr. England knew of but one efficient priest, an Irishman. Of Louisiana, he says: "Those regions contained an uninstructed and neglected population professing the Catholic religion without Catholic customs or religious knowledge, nearly bereft of a Catholic clergy." In the Middle West, which from being a French territory had become English, he saw nothing but the ruin of a once flourishing Church. The American Revolution was the prelude to the conquest of this territory; and "the American eagle, whilst he rose in the vigor of youth and the joy of victory, beheld no Catholic worship in the regions which oppression, strife, and war had now made desolate. The mighty wilderness was left to become the habitation of successive emigration from the East."

Dr. England now turns "to those places, which, from the original settlement, were under Protestant domination." Then follows a sketch of the religious history of the English colonies from Jamestown to the rise of the American Republic. This sketch deals almost exclusively with the long centuries of persecution and rapine which the Irish suffered from the days of Henry VIII to the days of the Georges. Without some knowledge of this portion of history, he writes,

> it is impossible to explain, properly, the difficulties which have retarded the progress of the Catholic religion in the United States. The true key to the explanation of many of these difficulties, which bewilder the unobserving, is to be found in a history which is overlooked or undervalued. No one will venture to assert that a generation is unaffected by the position of that which preceded it: and the vast majority of the Catholic population of the United States are descendants of those men, of whose struggles at home for the preservation of their religion and the defence of their country, I have endeavoured to trace an outline. England has, unfortunately, too well succeeded in linking contumely to their name in all her colonies;

and though the United States may have cast away the yoke under which she held them, many other causes combined to continue against the Irish Catholic, more or less, to the present day, the sneer of the supercilious, the contempt of the conceited, and the dull prosing of those who imagine themselves wise. That which more than a century of fashion has made habitual, is not to be overcome in a year, and to any Irish Catholic who has dwelt in this country during one-fourth of the period of my sojourn, it will be painfully plain that, although the evil is slowly diminishing, its influence is not confined to the American nor to the anti-Catholic. When a race is once degraded, however unjustly, it is a weakness of our nature that, however we may be identified with them upon some points, we are desirous of showing that the similitude is not complete. You may be an Irishman but not a Catholic; you may be Catholic but not Irish; it is clear you are not an Irish Catholic in either case! But when the great majority of the Catholics of the United States were either Irish or of Irish descent, the force of the prejudice against the Irish Catholic bore against the Catholic religion in the United States: and the influence of this prejudice has been far more mischievous than is generally believed.

Another erroneous notion Dr. England found in his journeys through Europe was that Maryland, founded by Catholics as a Catholic province, had remained Catholic up to the American Revolution. He had difficulty making his friends in Europe understand that "a few, and but a very few of the Catholic families had preserved their religion, and a portion of their property". The Catholics of Maryland were considered as part of the charge which fell to the London Vicar-Apostolic, but that dignitary did not or could not attend to their spiritual wants any better than "the Khan of Tartary." The boasted religious freedom of Pennsylvania is then described:

I have mentioned Pennsylvania, in which no laws were enacted to restrain religious freedom. Its legislature adhered to this principle, and, as it bordered upon Maryland, when the persecution became vigorous in this colony, several Catholics retired from Maryland into Pennsylvania, but they had scarcely any opportunity of seeing a priest, nor was the term "religious liberty" sufficiently understood by the Quakers to comprehend Catholicity. It is true, that they neither hanged, whipped, banished nor fined the members of our church for their faith, nor did they tax them as Irish servants; but there is that sol-

emn, cold, systematic avoidance which proclaims, in a way sufficiently intelligible, the dislike and condemnation which one avoids to express by words. I know of no better description of this conduct, than is contained in a common story told of a Quaker's conduct to a dog which he disliked. Looking at him as he saw some persons approach, he thus soliloquized, "I shall neither hang thee, nor shoot thee, nor strike thee, but I shall call thee by a name", and as the people were within hearing, he exclaimed "Mad dog!" The unfortunate animal was pursued by the crowd and stoned to death, whilst the man who gave the name stood by, expressing his compassion for the suffering dog, and subsequently lectured the crowd for their cruelty to dumb beasts. I do not by any means seek to convey by this repetition of a common story my notion of the character of the Society of Friends, amongst whom I have met several of the most benevolent individuals and kindest benefactors; but I give it as descriptive of what I do consider to have been the conduct of Pennsylvania towards the Catholics.

Previous to 1776, he says, few Irish Catholics settled in any of the colonies except Maryland and Pennsylvania. Some Irish servants had been transported to Virginia, and a number of German Catholics had located themselves in Pennsylvania. But the want of the clergy was so great, that no priest was to be met with in more than three or four spots of this extensive region:

Thus deprived of all spiritual aid, separated from their former associates, estranged from their kindred, mingled amongst sectaries, accustomed to hear their religion misrepresented, and its professors vilified and abused, and seeing no prospect of being able to resume its practices, great numbers of these persons made no profession of their faith; they were gradually drawn to attend the preaching and prayers of the sects; they intermarried with the members of these strange churches; their children, frequently unconscious of the religion of the parent, were educated in direct hostility to its tenets and its practices; so that, in fact, the descendants of far the greater portion of those Catholics who emigrated to the British American colonies, are now not only sectaries, but many of them the most virulent opponents of the Church of their ancestors.

The dawn of religious freedom in the period of the American Revolution (1775-1783) established a new state of affairs. The laws of persecution were removed from the statute-books of most of the thirteen States, "but however favorable this may be, it could

not supply a clergy, nor abolish long-standing and deep-rooted prejudices, which had been sedulously nourished by continued misrepresentations. And even after the Revolution, years had passed away before several of the states could be induced to repeal the British laws against the Catholics. It is only last year that North Carolina has placed them on an equality with her other citizens; and New Jersey has still a foul blot on her constitution."

Dr. England states that it is very difficult to estimate the number of Catholics in the United States in 1783. He thinks that "the clergy would be numbered very fully in putting it down as twenty-five. Indeed, I consider this as overrating it." Among the many causes which combined to remove religious prejudice in the new Republic, Dr. England records the various factors of Catholic cooperation in the Revolution. He considers the period immediately after the War of Independence, therefore, an exceedingly favorable moment to have taken advantage of the change of sentiment towards the Church, but a golden opportunity was lost because no well-informed, prudent and numerous body of clergymen was available. The Vicar-Apostolic of London had never shown much interest in the Catholics beyond the seas. Catholic England had no seminaries at home for the training of priests:

> Ireland was in a still worse position; yet the loss of the American colonies created in Great Britain a wholesome dread which too far exasperated the plundered population of this ill-treated land. In order to try and secure their attachment, during the war with France and the contest with the revolutionary colonies, the government of Ireland had considerably mitigated the ferocity of its persecution. The Irish Catholics wanted a good many priests and were very insufficiently supplied. As this island had no seminary within her borders, she was dependent upon those which the Catholic nations of Europe, especially France, had allowed to be opened upon their soil for the education of her zealous youth, who, in defiance of the prohibitions of those in power, ventured at the risk of their vengeance, to leave their country by stealth for that purpose, and to return in the face of every peril to serve upon the mission. Little of course could be then done by Ireland for America.

Priests were to be had from the Catholic nations of continental Europe, especially from France, where for a score of years mis-

rule and irreligion held sway. But there were obstacles to a successful ministry by clergymen from these lands. Here Bishop England returns to a conviction which by this time had become firm in his mind:

> The language of the Catholic nations being so different from the English tongue, which was that of the United States, and the almost impossibility for a foreigner to acquire it, in such a way, as to be a useful public speaker, left little inducement for zealous missionaries from the continent of Europe to enter upon these missions. There existed also other obstacles of no little moment, which rendered it unlikely that European priests could at that moment be usefully invited. The political principles of Europe and the vague notions which existed in regard to the revolution and the republicanism of the new states, were undefined and unsatisfactory; the manners and the habits of the Europeans were different from those of the Americans; the contemplation of those differences, added to that of the immense distance at which the great Atlantic then seemed to place the two hemispheres, the infrequency of communication, and a variety of similar difficulties, left little prospect of success as the result of any application. There was another obstacle, arising from the poverty of the Catholics as a body and the almost total absence of any funds, save what could be obtained from their generosity; the sole exception was, some property which had been originally destined for the missions that were served in early times by the Jesuits, and a portion of which had by a variety of contrivances been preserved, and which had at this period been legally vested in the priests of Maryland, who had been incorporated by the new government; and which has since insensibly passed into the possession of the Jesuits of Georgetown, in the District of Columbia, upon the condition of paying something towards the support of the archiepiscopal see of Baltimore. It was from this fund that the clergy then derived the principal means of their support.
>
> Thus, though the Catholics were now spread in greater or less numbers through the States, there were no clergymen save in Maryland and in Pennsylvania, and these were too few for the number who sought the aid of their ministry. In Maryland, they were pretty much spread in about a dozen places, but in Pennsylvania they could not be found in more than two or three spots outside of Philadelphia. Thus though the immigration commenced, the Catholic immigrants could find neither priest nor altar, nor associates in religious worship,

save in a very few spots of these immense regions. I have before described the consequences of this lamentable dearth. To this is to be attributed the melancholy result, that so many thousands of the descendants of these first settlers are now found in the various sects.

Between 1776 and the establishment of the See of Baltimore (1789), he says that probably not ten priests came from Ireland to minister to the Catholics here; and whilst the people were scattered through the country, these priests were kept in the principal cities and towns. "Nor is it to be imagined that all the clergymen who, in the early days of our republic, migrated from Europe, were actuated in their transfer of residence by the purest zeal, nor that they were the persons best qualified to promote the cause of religion. Some of them, indeed, were men of that description and were extremely useful; but others were driven across the Atlantic by disappointment or by censure, and though they rendered occasional services, they too often counterbalanced them by their scandals."

Dr. England hints at the crux of the situation: the first members of the American hierarchy from Carroll's day almost to the time he was writing were not fully cognizant of the numerous social and political forces at work around them. They tried to keep the Faith alive in this country by organizing the Church partly on the European system, omitting or avoiding those aspects of church government which they believed impossible of imitation here. Whether they were unaware of the omission is not certain, but no doubt existed in his mind that they did not endeavor to find a substitute for that part of canonical discipline which had been omitted. Thus, they stressed parochial and institutional life, and neglected to seek a substitute for public opinion. We are the inheritors of the system they inaugurated, Dr. England continues, and in consequence the Church was then a great congeries of unrelated units without any real strength of co-ordination. The hierarchy of the Church, for the first three or four decades of the established episcopate, was, with few exceptions, composed of prelates who had no contact with the formation of a Catholic public opinion. They were for the most part devoted to a short-sighted policy of measuring our needs by European standards. The memory of Europe hung

like a pall over a fast-growing group of newcomers who remained at heart exiles from their own lands. The Catholic future of America was fashioned at a time when that future should have been alive with the larger life America had brought into being and not influenced by leaders who watched the republicanism of the New World with anxious, if not troubled, eyes. It is problematical, he thought, whether the Catholic writers here had changed in any appreciable way the instinctive distrust Protestantism had of its purpose in the United States. It was indeed too early in our history to estimate the loss of the Church from this viewpoint, but in the various politico-religious crises through which the Church had passed up to Dr. England's day, he believed that our numbers were too insignificant in the general population to affect public opinion on the question of religious freedom.

The lack, therefore, of a strong Catholic public opinion at the beginning of the great immigration he put down as next in order to the lack of a properly qualified priesthood. The scattered Catholics at the opening of the nineteenth century "were destitute of pastors, their children were lost to the church; the greater number of the few who exercised the ministry, were unable to remove the erroneous impressions of such a people as were found over the States." In another paragraph he says:

> There were few opportunities; no books could be procured to defend Catholic doctrines, the principal portions of English literature, which necessarily became that of the United States, were filled with passages tending to destroy our religion by misrepresentation, by sophistry, by ridicule, and by wit; and through the whole country there was not found a press nor a bookseller to counteract this evil. The people sought for information upon the subject, and every source from which they could draw it was poisoned, every fountain at which they drank was tainted. Need we wonder at the continuance of prejudice, the dislike of our religion, the obloquy to which our principles and practices were exposed, or at the false shame which drew the pusillanimous from the profession of their creed?

The Church here had to depend for the formation of its clergy upon the members of a religious Congregation which had suffered cruelly in France at the close of the eighteenth century. It

was mainly from their ranks that the hierarchy was formed during the first generation of our established ecclesiastical order. No praise, he admits, is too high to bestow upon these zealous laborers in the American Vineyard, but they had to cope with difficulties which they could hardly overcome. Dr. England describes the situation as follows:

> Besides the difficulties arising from the diversity of language and customs, there were some that occasionally arose from difference of political predilections. They who outraged religion and massacred the clergy in France, desecrated the name of liberty by the anarchy and despotism to which they so wickedly and inappropriately gave that appellation; and they moreover rendered the name of republicanism odious through a large portion of the world, by the atrocities which they perpetrated under the semblance of its sanction; and although the clergy of France who had escaped to America were sufficiently aware of the wide distinction between the well-regulated order of American republicanism and the licentious and tyrannical infidelity which assumed that name in France, and though several amongst them were gradually becoming attached to American institutions, still, amongst others, unpleasant recollections were excited by the similarity of name, and this could not always exist without an unpleasant influence upon a man who had suffered grievously in the land he loved, for whose ruin he wept, and the memory of which, though dear to his heart, was blent with that of the murder of his cherished companions and devoted friends. It was not, and it could not be in his power always to suppress the exhibition of what he felt. Too often, the thoughtless or the envious, the enthusiastic admirer of liberty made a serious mistake, or took an unfair and an unkind advantage because of this exhibition. Hence, though the cause of religion in the United States gained greatly by this accession, yet it was not free from some disadvantage. And, perhaps, during the twenty years that succeeded the erection of the see of Baltimore, though there was a considerable increase of congregations and of religious opportunities, there was a vast loss to the Church, because there was not a body of clergy sufficiently numerous and perfectly fitted to attend the emigrants that arrived from Germany and from Ireland.

The foundation for much subsequent mischief and hence for the leakage of the half-century Dr. England is considering was laid by abettors of the trustee system, which opened the door to schism

and defection. Bishop England recognized the evils inherent in trusteeism, but he could not help contrasting the peace which arose from his own constitutional system and the sad history of other dioceses. The law of the United States protected church property as jealously as it did any private property. "I do not know", he writes, "any system more favorable to the security of religious rights and of Church property than that of the American law." He preferred it to the law of almost every Catholic country in the world. The American State was willing to grant the privilege of legal protection to all religious congregations upon the principles of association and contract:

> Upon these principles, there is no difficulty for a body of Catholics to assemble, to form themselves into an association, to recognize the power of their Pope, of their bishop, of their priests, and the several rights of each individual or body according to the doctrine and the discipline of their church; they can, without departing from that doctrine or discipline, regulate the manner in which the property is to be held, and how it shall be managed, and can establish rules to restrict and to direct its managers. In a word, they can voluntarily bind themselves by special acts to maintain and observe the whole doctrine and discipline of their church, and can regulate that no person shall be admitted a member of their association without his undertaking this obligation, or shall continue a member if he violates his contract for such observance. By this process of American law, no person is obliged to belong to any religious society except he shall desire it himself, and he cannot obtrude himself upon any religious society which is not willing to receive him, or whose constitution he violates; and the legal tribunals of the state must, should questions of litigation arise, govern their decisions by the constitution and by-laws of the Society itself, provided these laws are not incompatible with the laws of the particular state or of the United States. But where the society makes no constitution, or does not adopt any special regulations, but merely has persons chosen as trustees to manage its concerns, without any special restrictions; these trustees have the power to make all regulations and to change them as they may think proper, during the term for which they have been chosen. Thus there may be trustees with limited powers in the same churches, and in others their powers may be altogether undefined.

Where the Catholics failed, in Dr. England's opinion, was in not abiding by the technicalities of the law.

From these social and religious factors—the lack of a competent priesthood; the prevailing distrust of Catholicism; the absence of a strong Catholic public opinion; and the evils inherent in a wrongly directed system of church property incorporation—Bishop England deduces the main causes of the leakage. He then proceeds to give a rapid sketch of the Church here from the year 1808, when the first suffragan Sees of Baltimore were established. The principal causes for the leakage from 1808 to 1836, he lists as follows:

> 1st. The pouring in of vast numbers of Catholic emigrants upon a country, where nothing had been previously done to enable them to practise the duties of their religion, but where every obstacle existed to render its profession and its practice exceedingly inconvenient, especially to strangers. 2d. The want of opportunity for the education of children of Catholics in the religion of their parents. 3d. The exposure of the numerous orphans left by emigrant Catholics, whose death, or misfortune or criminality, left those unfortunate children to be educated in public institutions uncongenial to the religion of their parents. 4th. The want of a clergy sufficiently well-informed to be able to act with judgment, and in many instances badly acquainted with the language, often incapable of giving public instruction, and not sufficiently aware of the nature of the government, the law, or the genius of the country. 5th. The invasion of this mission by many priests, who in Europe were found to be incorrigibly bad, or unable to act except under the guidance of others. 6th. Injudicious appointments to places of administration. 7th. The want of mutual confidence and co-operation, arising from throwing together people of several nations well-disposed and zealous, yet having too many points of peculiar habits and divided interest to allow their sufficiently acting in a body. 8th. The vigilance, activity, wealth, and co-operation of the various Protestant societies, which, though divided in religious belief, still are united in every effort to weaken or oppose the Catholics.

During his stay in Rome in the summer of 1836, Dr. England presented to Pope Gregory XVI a *Memorial* containing practically all that was in his *Letter*, but giving, at the same time, a series of suggestions for the amelioration of conditions in the American Church. For more than fifteen years, he tells the Holy Father, he had given serious and uninterrupted reflection to the causes for the disorders which had marked the progress of the Church in the

United States and to their remedy. For most of the time, he says, he had little hope of any amelioration of conditions, but he wrote because he believed that few prelates were so well situated as himself to study the problem of loss and gain. Only the feeling that the Holy See might consider him as going beyond the limits of his duties had kept him from presenting at different times the results of his reflections. The *Memorial* deals with the problem of Church progress up to the year 1835.

In suggesting the remedies for the losses to the Catholic Faith in the United States, Dr. England again points out the necessity of a native clergy and a native hierarchy. The bishops and priests must understand the language of the American people, which is and will always be English, if they are to bring the truths of the Catholic religion to their hearers' hearts. They must know American customs and live by American customs, if they were to win the confidence and trust of American citizens. They must have an intimate knowledge of British and American religious history, in order to meet the opponents of the Church on their own ground. They must understand American laws and adapt ecclesiastical customs to these laws, if they were to protect their rights and the property entrusted to them. They must know English and American literature, if they were to write in the prevailing style and thus influence the growing mass of public opinion being formed by the American press. This was especially true of the younger generation of Americans who were holding fast to all things distinctly American. If foreign ways and habits, foreign methods, and foreign speech were to continue to be the outward signs of Catholicism, then there was little hope for any direct and salutary influence of Catholic thought upon the American Republic. If pastors, and especially bishops placed over American Sees, were foreigners, that is, subject to other countries or rulers, then the enemies of the Church needed no further argument that Catholicism was not adapted to the institutional life of republican America. If the Church is to be "*una chiesa forestiera, come non appartenente al paese*", then patriotic forces would be heard denouncing it as "*un dominio estraneo dentro il territorio Americano*". The Church in America must have a clergy who are assimilated to the spirit of the country. Otherwise, "*cosi si pense-*

rebbe di mandare il clero italiano in Francia e portare il clero francese ad officiar le chiese di Roma!"

Bishop England attached no blame to the Holy See for the wrong administration of Church affairs in the United States. In every case, Dr. England avers, the Holy See had acted to the best of its knowledge, but the efforts of Rome to give the nascent American Church its powerful support were frustrated in the United States by jealousies, lack of system, and absence of co-operation.

> In the eyes of the Catholic world, the United States presents an image of great growth and great prosperity in the foundations of religion. One Archbishop and eleven bishops, with so many colleges and convents established in so short a space of time as fifty years, present an arresting spectacle. But the truth is that all these things are relative, and to judge the progress of the missions accurately, it is not enough to stop with what has been done, but to consider whether all has been done which should have been accomplished.

Dr. England then repeats the statement with which we are familiar: namely, that in the increase from three to fifteen millions in the past fifty years, eight millions were emigrants and at least four millions of these should be Catholic, while in reality the Catholics numbered about one and a quarter millions. Some of the bishops, moreover, doubted whether there were a million Catholics in the United States in 1836.

Dr. England had no desire, he told Gregory XVI, to excite any feeling on the problem of loss and gain but rather to effect a plan of co-operation between the American bishops themselves and then between the hierarchy as a whole and the Holy See to avoid the continuance of what was evidently an evil, which he thought was profoundly rooted in American soil.

Such in concise form is the thesis held by Dr. England on the leakage in the American Church from 1787 until 1835. What is valuable to the historian of the Catholic Church in the United States is not the statistical basis for his assertion that we had lost 3,750,000 Catholics in that period of fifty years, but the causes which he describes so vividly for whatever leakage may have actually taken place in that period. If one accepts the United States census of 1790, and the official census of immigration after 1820, as substan-

tially correct, and it must be admitted in all fairness that the census needs to be followed with great caution, then Dr. England's estimate of the original stock of 1790 (3,000,000) growing to seven millions by 1836 is wrong. The official figures show that the original stock of 3,929,625 in 1790 had increased to 14,217,736 in 1835, while the total number of immigrants and their descendants is supposed to have amounted in 1835 to about 750,000. Should the estimates given by Bishop England be so far astray as these official figures indicate, it must be remembered that for over half of the fifty years he treats, we have no official figures for immigration into the country. This discrepancy does not affect the accuracy of the description of the hindrances to Church progress contained in his celebrated *Letter* to Lyons.

CHAPTER XXX

The Third Provincial Council Of Baltimore

(April 16-23, 1837)

The four years that intervened between the Second and the Third Provincial Councils of Baltimore (1833-1837) witnessed an alarming growth of anti-Catholic prejudice in the nation. The *Pastoral Letter* of 1833 had appealed to the instructed and tolerant members of the non-Catholic Churches to assist the Catholic prelates and the clergy in stemming the rising tide of bitterness against the Faith. While it would be a mistake to regard the anti-Catholicism of these years as a thoroughly planned invasion of their liberties, there was, nevertheless, so widespread a clamor against Catholics as *foreigners, paupers, monarchists, enemies of the Republic* (to mention a few of the epithets used by the non-Catholic religious press), and so many points of identity in the movement in various parts of the country that the suspicion will not down that efforts were being made to organize anti-Catholic prejudices into something like a compact national political front.

This effort failed, but not because these prejudices were weak, or because there was a lack of unanimity over the fear of the spread of the Catholic Church in the United States.

The failure proved that a second "Reformation" was impossible after three hundred years of Protestantism, not only because the Protestant sects apparently had lost the power of uniting among themselves, but more especially because leaders realized the dangerous invasion to the freedom of each individual sect, if the movement were successful against the Catholic Church. But had the suggestion made at the time for a General Convention or a Council of the Protestant Churches been possible, it is likely, in spite of the distaste the educated non-Catholics felt for the movement, that these years of diatribe and violence might have seen the country swept into legislation proscribing the exercise of Roman Catholic religion in the United States.

There were non-Catholics even then who could not palliate the "shame of Massachusetts" in its deliberate refusal to do justice to the victims of the mob in Charlestown. There were others who would not admit the least trace of veracity in those sinister volumes published over the names of fallen women, behind whom were ministers of Protestant Churches. A notable publishing house today draws a veil over its participation in the spread of this lewd and licentious literature. Elementary education had not penetrated far enough into the mass of the illiterate Native-American strongholds to teach the lesson that religious bigotry was an uncertain rallying cry for political purposes. Many others realized that the success of anti-Catholicism would be followed by secret or open warfare between the dominant Protestant sects.

The net result of the anti-Catholicism of the period 1820-1844 was a negative one. This is evident from a perusal of the current and ephemeral literature poured out upon the country by the anti-Catholic religious newspapers. Even in controversies, where an attempt was made to keep decorum and fair play present, such as in the Hughes-Breckinridge and the Purcell-Campbell debates, it was recognized that the resultant effect was a positive gain for Catholicism and a loss to the hold Protestantism had over educated minds. It was fatal to the anti-Catholic leaders when their prospective audiences learned that many of the doctrines held by Catholics were part of their own faith and that many of the unspeakable charges against the Faith were equally repudiated by Catholics themselves. The open and public debate soon lost its popularity.

Politically, Catholics were as carefully excluded from office as in England during these same years when the new liberty granted by the Act of Emancipation was one in name only. Religious liberty had been won in the British Isles after almost three centuries of persecution and ostracism; but Catholics had yet to win fair play. Those who flattered themselves that Catholic Emancipation meant the immediate beginning of a new era for religious liberty were to be sadly mistaken. Instead of allowing Catholics to take their rightful place in the national life, the Act of 1829 was the signal for a new and fiercer agitation which had as its purpose the repression of political equality in practice. "The feeling against

Papists was too strongly engrained in the minds of the nation to be eradicated at once by an Act of Parliament. The fight was long and laborious."[1] What was true for the British Isles, and particularly for Ireland, was equally true in the United States. If in 1833, four years after Emancipation, there was not in Ireland a single Catholic judge or stipendiary magistrate, if the chief towns were in the hands of the most intensely bigoted Corporations Ireland had ever seen, the reason is not hard to find: the Society of Orangemen was the barrier to complete political liberty in Great Britain and Ireland.

Wherever the English language was spoken, and especially wherever Irish Catholics were to be found in growing numbers within Protestant communities, recruiting agents were sent by the Orangemen to enroll members for the continuance of the political ostracism of Catholics. Success first met these agents in Canada; and as early as 1824 an Orange Lodge was set up in New York, and July 12, the anniversary of the Battle of the Boyne, became a day for outrages against the Catholics of so wanton a character that even Protestant magistrates grew alarmed. The retrospect shows only too unmistakably that the rioting, the burning of Catholic homes and institutions, the outrages against Catholic priests and nuns in our American cities and towns and the penalties the Irish-American Catholics were made to pay for the practice of their Faith during these years, were almost wholly directed by the Orange Lodges. Emancipation in Great Britain and Ireland in 1829 gave to Orangeism its strongest claim to rally its cohorts from every sect of Protestantism.

It is in the light of Orangeism that Dr. Brownlee and his magazine, the *Protestant,* are to be judged. It is in the light of the Orange Lodges that an explanation must be sought for the avidity with which the obscene attacks by Maria Monk and others of her ilk are to be estimated. John Talbot Smith has several paragraphs in his *History of the Catholic Church in New York* which give a masterly summary of the situation:

> The social and political leaders of the time did their utmost to keep the peace, with the exception of John Jay and his particular circle, who remained to the end consistent advocates of political disability for Catholics. The Whigs and the

[1]Ward, *Sequel to Catholic Emancipation,* vol. I, p. 3.

Democrats were the leading parties, and both sought the immigrant vote. The Democrats found greater favor with the naturalized citizen, because of their more liberal spirit in the matter of the suffrage; they had abolished or much reduced property qualifications for voters, and had resisted the Federalist attempt to extend the time of residence before a foreigner would be allowed to vote. Jefferson's generous spirit towards the common people and his faith in them were hateful to the aristocrats among the Federalists and Whigs, as they are hateful to the same class up to the present moment. The Irish immigrants became intense Democrats owing to the favor shown to them by the Democratic leaders, and the Whigs and all their successors have never been able to win them from that allegiance. The Orangemen and their allies naturally joined the other parties. Apart from these there existed a good number of native Americans who looked with distrust on the immense power and privilege given to immigrants within five years of their landing on the soil. They feared ill consequences, without regard to the creed of these people; but the fact that so many of the immigrants were Catholics intensified their natural dread. A longer probation, twenty-one year's residence, was advocated for the citizen-elect; also his complete exclusion from office; and by degrees the party of Nativism began to formulate its principles. In the course of time they formed an alliance with the Orangemen and their supporters, and added to the program such principles as would reduce the Catholic citizen to social slavery, if they could be worked into legislation.

In the period up to 1825 the Catholic emigrants to New York State were mostly Irish, who brought with them from their native country a great knowledge of the Republic, profound admiration for its success over England, and true affection for its principles, whose working was clearly visible and wholly beneficent in their own case. Free labor, good wages, the right to vote, the privilege of buying or taking up land, decent treatment as human beings, flattering treatment as citizens, were theirs without question or hindrance. They had suffered incredibly from the absence of these blessings in Ireland, where they were mere slaves of the soil, persecuted, harassed, and kept in desperate poverty. These people became more American than the Americans, and knew how to appreciate the blessings of civic freedom far better than the natives, who had always enjoyed such blessings. They looked up to the Fathers of the Republic as to the saints, kept the national holidays with a fervor that surprised all, and took the oath of allegiance to the United States with a fervor the deeper that

they were asked to forswear allegiance to King George, for whom they had no loyalty, no feeling except hate. They became Democrats by instinct not by persuasion. They swore by Andrew Jackson and wasted no praise on John Quincy Adams, and no bribe of money, place, or favor could win them from the party founded by Jefferson. John Bach McMaster, the historian of the American people, studied the original documents to small purpose when he could write of the Irish that though naturalized they were not Americanized, that our history, our principles, our welfare concerned them not, for they cared nothing for our great events and days, and that they cast a united vote in behalf of whichever party would buy it at the highest price. . . .

An era of ill-feeling toward Catholics began, which took the form of universal petty persecution. The old kindliness which led to such scenes as the dedication of the New York Cathedral, when mayor and aldermen walked in the procession, entirely disappeared. The few who dared to keep up kindly relations had to suffer from the bitter reproaches of their friends, like Mr. Gouverneur Kemble of Cold Spring, who was denounced for contributing to the building of the Catholic Church in that town. The persecution took many forms. When misfortune sent a Catholic to the poorhouse or a Catholic child to the orphan asylum, both were shut off from the practice of their faith forever. The priests were not permitted to enter a public institution to administer the sacraments to the dying, to instruct the children, to gratify the inmates with religious comfort. The power of the State was thus used to further the spread of Protestantism. In some cases where the priest demanded entrance, and enforced his right with threats of legal proceedings, artifice was resorted to that he might be driven off.

Not only were Catholics shut out of public office, but all positions of worth were closed against them, except the most menial occupations; and these were granted with insult, while many ministers argued that Catholics were unfit by nature for anything better. In many towns, districts and factories Catholics would not be employed at any price, and their application for work brought them only insult. Criminals of Catholic faith were refused the rites of their Church, and made to feel a double degradation. In time social equality failed even the wealthy and well-born Catholics, so bitter became the feeling against them. The children in the common school were neglected by the Protestant teacher, and often beaten by the scholars out of pure malevolence, whether Irish born or of Irish parents, or remotely of Irish blood, and their blood

mattered nothing if they were Catholics. The result of this universal persecution was to chill the Catholic emigrant's hearty affection for the natives; he was driven back upon himself, into a sort of ghetto; he brought up his children and his grandchildren apart from the natives, taught them they were Irish, and gave them a scorn of the Yankees.

The persecution of the Catholics increased in extent and virulence, and provoked the inevitable response. Workmen fought at the bench, children fought at school, mothers wrangled on the doorsteps, church meetings were annoyed by dead cats and vegetables thrown by hoodlums, editors wrote bitterly of the encroachments of Romanism, the whole country was thrown into a state of irritation and unrest which had to culminate in catastrophe. The inhabitants of Sullivan County drew up a petition to Congress which expressed not only their feelings but the feelings of the majority of the nation, in which they asked that the right to vote be denied to Romanists, and that State officers be appointed to inspect monasteries, convents and other institutions managed by Catholics.[2]

The astounding fact is that, in the midst of all these disturbing elements, the Catholic Church grew stronger both in numbers and in influence with each passing year. In 1833, the Catholic Church in the United States constituted a single province, with one Archbishop (Whitfield) and eleven bishops: Boston, New York, Philadelphia (2), Bardstown (2), Charleston, Cincinnati, St. Louis, Mobile, and New Orleans. Two former members of the American hierarchy were in foreign Sees: Cheverus was Archbishop of Bordeaux, and Du Bourg Archbishop of Besançon. The *Catholic Almanac* for 1834 gives the following number of priests for each diocese: Baltimore, 68; Philadelphia, 44; New York, 27; Boston, 26; Charleston, 14; Mobile, 11; New Orleans, 28; St. Louis, 34; Bardstown, 35; and Cincinnati, 19.

Progress was visible also in the growth of the Catholic press. Between 1830 and 1840 the Catholic population of the United States more than doubled, and a conservative estimate of the Catholics in the country in 1840 is 1,150,000, with 482 priests to minister to their spiritual needs. The number of immigrants reaching the United States between 1830 and 1840 is estimated at close to 600,000; of these about 235,000 were Catholics. Over 155,000 of these were

---

[2] *History of the Catholic Church in New York*, vol. I, pp. 127-133.

Irish, the remainder being divided between the other European stocks, the Germans coming next in point of numbers to the Irish with a total immigration from Germany of 34,301.

An interesting series of documents exists in the Vienna Archives for 1836, containing a petition of the German Catholics of Philadelphia for a bishop of their own nationality. In May, 1836, two long historical memorials were sent by a committee of German Catholics of Philadelphia, consisting of J. J. Ritter, B. J. Schipper, L. Schmitz, Peter Biedermann, and A. Reinhart, to the Austrian Emperor and to Pope Gregory XVI, concerning the situation of the German Catholics in that city and in the United States generally. Ritter came to the United States in July, 1824, and was shocked to find that there was no German school in Holy Trinity parish, where Father Roloff was pastor. The German Lutheran and German Reformed Churches had parochial schools, where the children were taught in German, but Father Roloff insisted upon all German children being trained in "English" schools. After Father Roloff's departure in 1828, Holy Trinity was given an English-speaking pastor. The Germans who could not understand English found it very difficult to attend to their spiritual duties, and Ritter relates one unhappy scene where a dying girl had to submit to having her confession translated into English by a bystander before receiving the last Sacraments. Application had been made to Father Matthews, then Administrator-Apostolic of the Diocese of Philadelphia, but the Germans could obtain no redress: *"Geld lag ihm näher am Herzen als unser Seelenheil!"*

Ritter wrote many letters during this troublesome time to the Rev. Dr. Raes, Director of the Seminary of Mainz, and was advised by his correspondent to apply to the Sacred Congregation de Propaganda Fide for a German bishop.[3] When Dr. Kenrick was appointed Coadjutor-Bishop of Philadelphia, there was considerable ill-feeling among the Germans, because he was thought to be "Irish" in his attitude. About the end of 1828, the Rev. Cornelius Van der Braak, a Dutch priest, came to Philadelphia and was appointed temporarily pastor of the parish. In 1832, at the invitation of

[3]A thorough search in the summer of 1926, both in Mainz and in Strassburg, of which See Dr. Raes later became bishop, failed to discover these letters.

Bishop Kenrick, Father Guth came to Philadelphia and was appointed assistant to Van der Braak, who was then an invalid. Father Guth was not popular, and in August, 1834, Father Lemke arrived in the United States, and was appointed by Dr. Kenrick assistant to Father Guth.[4] Ritter is silent on the reason for Father Lemke's retirement from the parish, but he left Philadelphia in October, 1834, owing to an altercation with the trustees who found fault with one of his sermons, in which he spoke rather bitterly about Martin Luther. Ritter then gives short sketches of the priests who followed, Masquelet, Gasser, and Stahlschmidt, and their difficulties with Dr. Kenrick. The feeling was rather general that Bishop Kenrick had no love for the Germans. Owing to this fact, German Catholics were not settling in Pennsylvania. The only priests who were then (1836) attending to the Germans were Father Guth in Philadelphia and Father Masquelet in Pittsburgh. Both had studied in Alsace and were more French than German. According to Ritter's committee the two clergymen were skilfully directing the affairs of the German Catholics to their own satisfaction and carefully keeping real German priests from entering the diocese.

Ritter and his group saw but one way to assist the German Catholics of the East in their difficulties, and that was for his Majesty, the Emperor, to use his influence with the Holy See to secure a German Bishop for the United States: "*Ein Wink von dem Mächtigsten der christlichen Monarchen*", and the Holy See would send them a bishop at once! The charity of the Leopoldine Association for the Church in this country was a sufficient reason for granting the boon they desired. At the same time a similar *Memorial* was sent to Pope Gregory XVI, dated Philadelphia, May 17, 1836, and an appeal was made to the Holy Father to save the faith of the German Catholics by appointing a German Bishop for Pennsylvania. Both Fathers Guth and Masquelet are denounced in the *Memorial* for conduct unbecoming to the priesthood.[5]

The contents of the *Memorial* were made known to Dr. Kenrick by the Holy See, and on July 19, 1837, he replied in a long letter exposing the influences back of the committee's request. On October

---

[4]*Records* (ACHS), vol. IX, p. 129.
[5]Prop. Arch., *Scritt. rifer., Amer. Cent.*, vol. 11, fol. 480.

9, 1837, Propaganda wrote to the Austrian Ambassador to the Holy See, Count Rudolf von Lützow, that Dr. Kenrick was a trustworthy and just bishop and that his explanation was accepted. The demand for a German bishop was then dropped.[6]

Archbishop Whitfield was in his sixty-third year when the Second Provincial Council (October, 1833) closed its sessions. His health was not good, and shortly after the Council he applied for a co-adjutor. The consecration of Archbishop Eccleston on September 14, 1834, relieved him of anxiety in the matter of the succession. After Dr. Eccleston's consecration, Archbishop Whitfield began to sink rapidly. "His physicians had already advised him to visit some medicinal springs for the renovation of his health, but the progress of disease soon became alarming. For months he had felt the decay of a constitution, not naturally strong, and further debilitated by the toil and anxiety inseparable from his weighty charge. After a few weeks' illness which he bore with Christian fortitude, and with the tender piety of one who had been long familiar with the cross of his Blessed Master, he calmly expired on the 19th of October, 1834, in the sixty-fourth year of his age, and the seventh of his episcopacy."[7] On October 21, his remains were borne in procession from his late residence to the Cathedral, where a Solemn Requiem Mass was offered by the Most Rev. Dr. Eccleston.

The funeral sermon was preached by Rev. L. R. Deluol of Saint Sulpice. Prudence and energy were the distinctive marks in the character of Archbishop Whitfield. He was simple in his tastes and somewhat austere. The personal property which he had inherited and which was considerable for that day was bequeathed to the Archdiocese of Baltimore.

Samuel Eccleston was born near Charlestown, on the eastern shore of Maryland. His grandfather, John Eccleston, emigrated from England about 1750, and settled in Kent County, Maryland, where he soon acquired a large plantation. After her husband's death, Mrs. Eccleston married a Catholic, named Stenson, and soon became a Catholic herself. The son by her first marriage, Samuel, was reared in the Faith, and was sent to St. Mary's College,

[6] *Ibid., Lettere,* vol. 318, fol. 829.
[7] Shea, *op. cit.,* vol. III, p. 437.

Baltimore. On July 23, 1819, he entered St. Mary's Seminary, and was ordained to the priesthood on April 24, 1825. Before his ordination he had determined to enter the Society of Saint Sulpice, and shortly afterwards was sent to Issy to make the year's noviciate at the Solitude there. On his return to America, he was appointed Vice-President of St. Mary's College, Baltimore, and in 1829 became President of that institution. He was occupied with the duties attached to that office when his appointment as coadjutor-archbishop was made by the Holy See.

The progress of the Church between the Second and Third Provincial Councils (1833-1837) was remarkable not only in the older dioceses but also in the West and Northwest, where Detroit (1833) and Vincennes (1834) had been erected as episcopal Sees.

Detroit was established on March 8, 1833, after several attempts to decide its boundaries and its episcopal head. Father Frederic Rese, administrator of the Diocese of Cincinnati after the death of Bishop Fenwick, was chosen as Detroit's first bishop. Dr. Rese was in his forty-second year when appointed. With his consecration in St. Peter's Cathedral (October 3, 1833), the Territory of Michigan and the remainder of the Northwestern Territory passed from the See of Cincinnati, which henceforth was confined to the State of Ohio. Few clergymen of the thirties had accomplished so much for the American Church as Rese, since it was to him in a particular manner, as we have already seen, that the foundation of the Munich and Vienna Societies was due.

In a letter to the Vienna Society, dated November 8, 1833, Dr. Rese stresses the fact that he was the first German bishop in the United States.[8] Dr. Rese found in his co-workers in the new diocese some of the most celebrated missionaries the Church has ever had in this country: Baraga, Mazzuchelli, Badin, Desceille, Vanderpoel, de Bruyn, Banduel, Vizzoczky.

Bishop Rese found himself involved in difficulties from the very outset. Shea describes his arbitrary methods with his clergy, who laid complaints against his system of jurisdiction, and mentions as a contributory cause Rese's conflict with the Abbess of the Poor Clares of Pittsburgh "in regard to the property and management

[8] *Berichte*, vol. VII, pp. 1-4.

of the community." Among the various duties his new post brought to him was that of Provincial over the Poor Clares, who had recently come from Belgium and had settled in Pittsburgh. Apparently trouble in the management of the Poor Clares' Abbey in Pittsburgh arose immediately after Dr. Rese's appointment as Provincial. Propaganda informed Bishop Kenrick on March 8, 1836, that Father Van der Weijer, the chaplain of the nuns, had written a letter to Propaganda on May 4, 1835, in which he related that Dr. Rese had forced upon the nuns a candidate for their community, threatening the nuns with excommunication when they refused to receive her. It would seem that the Poor Clares regarded Dr. Rese's candidate in the light of a possible enemy, such as the two women who had caused so much sorrow by their obscene publications against the nuns of Boston and Montreal. The Sacred Congregation advised Kenrick to attend to the Pittsburgh difficulty at once.[9] On May 29, 1836, Van der Weijer wrote again to Propaganda, warning the Cardinal-Prefect that the scandal could not be kept much longer within the walls of the convent. The Community was determined not to accept Dr. Rese's postulant, who was then in the house by his orders. Owing to their opposition, Bishop Rese had placed the convent under an interdict and refused to allow the nuns to receive the Sacraments.[10] Father Van der Weijer he suspended. In June, Bishop Rese came to Philadelphia to consult with Dr. Kenrick on the situation. The result, as Van der Weijer wrote to Propaganda on June 24, 1836, was that both bishops agreed to continue the interdict and his suspension.

On September 8, 1835, Propaganda had written to Bishop Rese, asking him to deal gently with the nuns, and advising him, if it were true that the postulant he had insisted upon their receiving was a woman of ill repute, to dismiss her at once. The Sacred Congregation was very much troubled by the letters it had received, and asked Dr. Rese to restore order within the convent without delay.[11] What Dr. Rese's answer was is uncertain, but it is evident from

[9]Prop. Arch., *Lettere*, vol. 317, fol. 188.
[10]*Ibid.*, *Scritt. rifer., Amer. Cent.*, vol. 11, fol. 478.
[11]*Ibid.*, *Lettere*, vol. 316, fol. 666.

Cardinal Fransoni's letter of November 17, 1835, that Rome was not satisfied with the action taken.[12]

On December 8, 1836, Propaganda wrote to Bishop Kenrick, ordering that the nuns be permitted to receive the Sacraments at once, since their case was under consideration at Rome and no decision had yet been made. Two days previous to this, the Sacred Congregation replied to the Mother Abbess that the interdict was removed, and that Dr. Kenrick would be informed that no privation of the Sacraments would be permitted. Dr. Kenrick wrote immediately to Father Benedict Bayer, C. SS. R., then Pastor of St. Patrick's Church in Pittsburgh, giving him jurisdiction to administer the Sacraments to the nuns. Propaganda's study of the case resulted in the abrogation of Dr. Rese's powers as Provincial, and the convent was then placed under Bishop Kenrick's jurisdiction (February 12, 1837). From the letters received in Rome, the Sacred Congregation decided it prudent not to continue Father Van der Weijer in his post as chaplain. This news was carried to Dr. Rese by letter of March 7 from the Sacred Congregation. Dr. Rese was not, however, to consider the transfer of his jurisdiction as blame for his conduct towards the rebelling nuns.

The documents likewise contain the information that the Mother Abbess had accused Bishop Rese of maladministration of funds she had placed in his hands for a foundation in Detroit.

An unfortunate episode in which Dr. Rese was involved occurred in Baltimore, and this became known to the prelates who assembled at Archbishop Eccleston's house in Baltimore on April 16, 1837, to begin their deliberations in the Third Plenary Council. Other difficulties had arisen between Dr. Rese and his priests; and, no doubt, acting upon the advice of his brother prelates, Rese presented at the second private congregation of the Council, April 18, his resignation as Bishop of Detroit, which was dated April 15, 1837. When the Council was over, Archbishop Eccleston placed in the bundle of letters and documents to be sent to the Holy See a private request to Cardinal Fransoni to accept Dr. Rese's resignation at once for the good of religion in the United States. Dr. Eccleston's letter makes sad reading, for it uncovers a pathetic ending to what had

[12] *Ibid.*, fol. 775.

been a brilliant career of a priest whose apostolic zeal had accomplished so much for the American Church. It was feared that Rese's resignation would be unfavorably received by the officials at Munich and Vienna, and that the Church here would have to bear their ill-will in case such a feeling should arise. Dr. Rese set out for Rome in June, since it was decided to take no action upon his resignation until he had been heard personally in Rome.

Upon arriving in Europe Dr. Rese began collecting funds for the Diocese of Detroit, until he was ordered by the Sacred Congregation to cease (January 16, 1838). Propaganda considered such collections for a particular diocese as an interference with the general work of the Lyons and Vienna Societies, both of which had been liberal in their subsidies to Detroit. Propaganda was obliged to write to Dr. Rese on March 10, 1838, asking him again to cease collecting money in Vienna.

Whether Dr. Rese continued his journey from Vienna to Rome to give the information Propaganda needed on his diocese, is not certain. The *Truth Teller* for July 22, 1838, announces his return to New York after thirteen months in Europe. It would appear from a letter dispatched to Dr. Rese on June 19, 1838, by the Cardinal-Prefect, that he had not gone to Rome, for he is peremptorily commanded to come at once to give an account of his stewardship. The documentary evidence would lead one to believe that his resignation was over-ruled by the Holy See, but that the matter of money entrusted to him by the Poor Clares had aroused the Sacred Congregation, for he was reminded that such a transaction was sacred in the eyes of God and would imperil his salvation. Dr. Rese was in Rome in 1841, and in such ill health that he was incapacitated for duty. Detroit was ruled by two administrators, Fathers de Bruyn and Badin, until the appointment of Bishop Peter Paul Lefevre as administrator in 1841. Dr. Rese retained his title Bishop of Detroit until his death in 1871.[13]

The Diocese of Vincennes, which had been proposed by the Second Provincial Council of 1833, was erected on May 6, 1834, by Pope Gregory XVI, and Simon William Gabriel Bruté de Remur was chosen as its first bishop. Dr. Bruté was consecrated in the Cathe-

[13]Cf. Reuss, *Biog. Cyclopedia etc.*, pp. 93-94.

dral of St. Louis on October 28, 1834. Dr. England had voted against his nomination at the Second Provincial Council.

The Third Provincial Council opened in Baltimore on the third Sunday after Easter, April 16, 1837, at ten in the morning. After the procession from the Archbishop's house into the Cathedral, Solemn Pontifical Mass was celebrated by Archbishop Eccleston. The sermon was delivered by Bishop Francis P. Kenrick of Philadelphia, who was to succeed to the Metropolitan See on Eccleston's death in 1851. At the end of the Mass, the pontifical oath was administered to Bishops Chabrat, Clancy, Bruté and Blanc, who were participating in a Provincial Council for the first time. There were present the following prelates: Bishops Rosati (St. Louis), Fenwick (Boston), Kenrick (Philadelphia), Purcell (Cincinnati), Chabrat (Bardstown), Clancy (Charleston), Bruté (Vincennes), and Blanc (New Orleans). Dr. England arrived in time to take part in the first private session the following morning. Bishop Dubois was represented by Father Felix Varela, who was seated in the Council as Procurator of the Bishop of New York.[14] Bishop Flaget was absent in Europe, and Bishop David did not come, while Bishop Portier was unable to reach Baltimore in time. Bishop Fenwick of Boston and Father Deluol, the Vicar-General of Baltimore, were designated promoters of the Council, and the Rev. Doctors Damphoux and Charles I. White were named secretaries. The masters of ceremonies were Rev. Francis Lhomme and Rev. Hugh Griffin, while Fathers Radanne and Fredet were named cantors. Others given the privilege of attending the sessions in their official capacity were: Father William McSherry, S. J., Provincial of the Jesuits of Maryland; and Father P. J. Verhaegan, S. J., Superior of the Jesuits of Missouri; Rev. Thomas F. Mulledy, S. J., President of Georgetown University; Rev. John J. Chanche, President of St. Mary's University; and Rev. Thomas Butler, President of Mount St. Mary's College. The consulting Theologians were: Father Louis de Barth (Kenrick); Father Peter Richard Kenrick (Bruté); Father John Hughes (Clancy); Father Peter Schreiber (Eccleston); Father S. T. Badin (Purcell); Father Regis Loisel (Rosati); Father

[14]Cf. Rodriquez, *Vida del Presbitero Don Félix Varela* (New York, 1828); Bayley, *Early History of the Catholic Church etc.*, p. 125 (New York, 1870).

Ignatius Reynolds (Chabrat); Father Augustine Verot (Blanc). Bishop England did not choose a Theologian.

The first public session was held at four o'clock in the afternoon of Monday, April 17, and after the invocation of the *Veni Sancte Spiritus*, Archbishop Eccleston declared the Council open. Rules were settled upon for the various meetings, both public and private. On Thursday, April 18, Dr. Rese presented his resignation to the prelates. At the second public meeting, on April 18, Father John Hickey, the Superior of the Sisters of Charity of Emmitsburg, was admitted. In the third private congregation of April 19, the first four decrees were voted upon and passed.

The first decree dealt with the ordination of priests *titulo missionis*, and regulated the oath to be taken before the conferring of Holy Orders and the acceptance of the mission where they were assigned. In the second decree the bishops warned the faithful of their duty of contributing to the proper support of their pastors. In many congregations throughout the country old and infirm priests were being neglected by the people, and it was decided that in each diocese a Clerical Fund be created for their support. The third decree made the *Ceremonial*, which had been voted in the First Provincial Council, the uniform ritual for the Church in the United States. The fourth decree was one that Dr. England had long urged upon the bishops, namely, that all ecclesiastical property in each diocese be secured by the best means the civil law afforded.

On April 20, the Solemn Pontifical Requiem for the deceased prelates and clergy of the Province was sung by Bishop Fenwick of Boston, and the sermon was delivered by Dr. England. In concluding his discourse, Dr. England paid a tribute to the three members of the American hierarchy who had died since the previous Council: Archbishop Du Bourg of Besançon (December 12, 1833), Archbishop Whitfield (October 19, 1834), and Cardinal de Cheverus, Archbishop of Bordeaux (February 1, 1836).

On April 21, the fifth and sixth decrees were voted and passed. The fifth decree legislated for uniformity in following the *Roman Ritual;* and the sixth prohibited priests from bringing ecclesiastical cases before civil tribunals. The seventh, eighth, ninth, tenth and

eleventh decrees, passed on April 22, dealt with priests who solicited financial help outside their own parishes; with Church music; with the abrogation of the major ferials after Easter and Pentecost as holydays of obligation; with the Wednesday abstinence in Advent, and finally with the convocation of the next Council which was to be held on the fourth Sunday after Easter, in 1840.

The decrees are signed by the Archbishop and nine bishops, the Bishop of Charleston signing first, as the senior member of the hierarchy present.

At the final session on April 23, Bishop Rosati sang the Solemn Pontifical Mass, and Dr. England again preached, taking as his text the twenty-eighth verse of the twentieth chapter of the *Acts*: "*Take heed to yourselves, and to the whole flock, wherein the Holy Ghost hath placed you bishops, to rule the Church of God which he hath purchased with his own blood.*"

The *Pastoral Letter*, issued on April 22, 1837, is the most forcible of all the documents issued to the laity by the seven Provincial Councils from 1829 to 1849. Naturally, the authorship belongs in the first place to the committee selected by the bishops to draw up the principal heads or topics, and in the final draft the entire body of the bishops present must be accredited with its success. But the tone and the language, the style, and the vision, are unmistakably those of the Bishop of Charleston. Its dominant note is a courageous defence of the Catholics from those who for almost a decade of years had, in Gallitzin's phrase, tried "to exhibit above one hundred millions of Catholics as standing upon a level with heathens, to represent the whole of them as a superstitious set, wandering in the paths of darkness, and finally to exclude the Catholics of the United States from their rank of citizens."[15] The prelates who met at Baltimore in the spring of 1837 were not a timorous body; but it was the boldest of them who penned the sentence which struck at the very heart of anti-Catholic prejudice: "We owe no religious allegiance to any State in this Union, nor to its general government." It is to John England's credit that he could not agree with Dr. Kenrick who had endeavored to prevent the Hughes-Breckinridge controversy, and that he would not keep the silence

[15] *Defence of Catholic Principles*, p. 5. Winchester, Va., 1818.

which Dr. Eccleston and his ecclesiastical advisers in Baltimore believed politically necessary during the Presidential election of 1840.

The *Pastoral Letter* speaks frankly of the shame of Massachusetts in not bringing to justice the criminals who destroyed the Charlestown Convent. It strikes out fearlessly at those members of the Protestant ministry who were responsible for the obscene anti-Catholic literature then at its flood-tide in the country, and it points out a fact which Protestant leaders themselves only later realized, the malicious influence of these anti-Catholic books on public morals.

> Nothing is more surely calculated [we read], for the destruction of that purity which is the soul of virtue, than the perusal of lascivious tales; and never did the most unprincipled author compile any work more foul in this respect, than the productions of our assailants, and never was there exhibited a more voracious appetite for mischievous aliment than that which they have unfortunately excited. With what avidity have not the numerous and heavy editions of those immodest fictions been taken up, disseminated through the country, purchased and introduced in the name of religion amongst the aged and young of both sexes.[16]

Anti-Catholicism meant anti-Christianity. The *Pastoral Letter* does not draw a veil over the object the anti-Catholic forces were striving to obtain, the destruction of the Roman Catholic Church:

> What an encouragement it is then to the opponents of Christianity when our revilers proclaim that five-sixths of the christian world are immoral hypocrites or the dupes of such monsters of iniquity. Yet such is the accusation seriously made! We have then, since the production of those charges, and we believe, encouraged by their promulgation, beheld organized bands of unbelievers, systematically arrayed, occupying the ground thus yielded to them by those who affect such zeal for Christianity; we have seen them celebrating with anticipated but indeed premature triumph the destruction of the christian name. How will our accusers dislodge them from their position, when they exultingly proclaim that the principles and practice of five-sixths of the Christian world during three centuries, and of entire Christendom during the preceding ages, have been grossly corrupt, necessarily demoralising, and in direct opposition to what they call the spirit of christianity?[17]

[16]Guilday, *National Pastorals etc.*, p. 93.
[17]*Ibid.*, p. 94.

Among the other topics dealt with in the *Letter* are: the spirit of Christ as exhibited by the Church in times of persecution; the religious duties of Catholics; the lingering remnants of trusteeism; the growing need of vocations to the priesthood; the dissemination of Catholic books; the Catholic press; the education of Catholic children; the work of the priesthood; and the duties of the clerical state. Few official documents of the American hierarchy hold up a more perfect mirror in which is reflected the inner life of the Church at the time.

Nearly seven weeks passed after the close of the Council before Dr. England was free to return to Charleston. On May 20, 1837, he wrote a long letter to Father O'Neill, the editor of the *Miscellany*, and its contents exhibit the astounding energy of Charleston's prelate:

> I have been delayed here much longer than I had originally intended: during the Council, I had to preach only once, which was on Thursday, the 20th of April, in the Cathedral, at the second public session, upon the occasion of the High-mass for the deceased prelates. I had also to preach on Sunday, the 23rd in the same church at the third public session on the occasion of terminating the Synod, and expected that I could have on the next day begun to compile my report on the mission to Haiti, and by transmitting it to the Holy See, close all my duties without my Diocess, and then return to remain thenceforth uninterruptedly at home. In this calculation however I was baffled; for in the first place, I was placed upon a committee to do some business after the adjournment of the council, by which I was detained here at least a fortnight: and again, the Rev. J. Hughes who had been invited to preach on the occasion of consecrating the church of St. John, in Frederick, was not only indisposed, but afflicted by the recent death of his father, and I could not refuse his request to become his substitute. The consecration took place on Wednesday the 26th, and on the next day I returned hither. I had promised the Archbishop to preach at the Cathedral on the Sundays at High-mass during my stay, and the subject which I had to treat of on Sunday the 30th required at least three discourses—so that I had to assign the evenings of Tuesday the 2nd of May and Friday the 5th for the continuation,—Monday the 1st being the festival of SS. Philip and James, I was prevailed upon to preach at the solemn High-mass in the Church of St. James, of which the Rev. Mr. Gildea is

pastor, in the outlets of this city; and it was impossible for me to refuse my friend, the Rev. Mr. Kerney, who said that his Irish flock at St. Patrick's, Fell's point, *must have me* on the festival of the Ascension. After having on Sunday the 7th, kept my appointment with the Archbishop at the Cathedral, I was obliged to give Monday the 8th to the Carmelite Nuns, and to preach at the dedication of their little chapel at Asquith-street. The Archbishop performed the ceremony, assisted by the Bishops of St. Louis and of Boston. Next day, Tuesday the 9th, the Archbishop, assisted by the same prelates, laid the corner stone of a stone edifice, the church of St. Paul, near Ellicott's Mills, within about a dozen miles of this city, and here I had to preach to a very large congregation assembled in the open air on a delightful spot, the acclivity of a hill with the untouched trees of the forest crowning the summits of the romantic heights, the fine stream of the Patapsco moving multiplied machinery of various mills and factories along its banks in the vallies, the Baltimore and Ohio rail-road ranging above its borders; lovely dwellings studding the eminences and a thriving village spreading out its extent and sending forth the hum and tokens of its industry. I had firmly to resist a number of other applications and confine myself to the business which I had undertaken. Of course I had to appear in the Cathedral on the festival of Pentecost, Sunday the 14th, and to preach for the Rev. Doctor Damphoux, at St. Peter's on Monday last the 15th. To-morrow I again preach in the Cathedral on the festival of the Holy Trinity, and then, God willing, on Monday I shall leave this in the boat for Norfolk, to proceed by that route into North Carolina, in order to make the visitation of that District, which Doctor Clancy's indisposition prevented his attending to.

I have completely discharged the duty which was assigned me by my colleagues, and I have also perfected and transmitted my report of my late mission, and earnestly intreated in language which I hope will be sufficiently persuasive, that I may now be permitted to rest quietly within my own borders and be occupied only with the care of my own Diocess. Indeed I am heartily sick of the occupations in which I have been engaged abroad.[18]

The situation of the Church at the close of the Council was not an encouraging one. Outside the Fold the forces of anti-Catholicism were growing stronger every day, and it was only a question of time when restraint would be thrown off and violence, rioting, burning

[18]Printed in the *Cath. Misc.*, vol. XVI, p. 383.

and murder, would take the place of the earlier controversial methods of attack. Within the Church among the prelates there was little unanimity of thought upon the policies to be pursued in the face of the rising opposition from the non-Catholic politico-religious camp. Dr. England believed he had been unworthily treated by his brother-prelates at the Council of 1833. His national prominence made him the logical point of attack by the Native-American groups, and he expected the support of his colleagues in the episcopate. In fighting his way through the enemies his outspoken columns in the *Miscellany* had created, he was intent upon trying to bring sanity and prudence into the anti-Catholic movement which was then threatening not only the religious but the political rights of Catholics. In this he felt not only abandoned by almost all of his brother-prelates, who believed in a policy of dignified silence, but even by the faithful of his own diocese.[19] At the very height of the contest he was waging against an element in American Protestant circles which was dechristianizing the country with its literature, he was obliged to appeal to his people more than once to save the *Miscellany* from suspension.

John England never won the good will of the prelates who composed our hierarchy during the years of his episcopate. His attitude towards what he believed to be an undue influence on American Church affairs proceeding from St. Mary's Seminary weakened the support he might have received from the Society of Saint Sulpice. It is clear from the extant documentary evidence that he was in consequence kept out of two Sees where his influence would have been of untold weight in stemming the tide against Catholicism—Baltimore and New York. The suspicion of the French element in the hierarchy that he had an influence over Bishops Kenrick, Purcell, and Hughes, was a mistaken one. To no one bishop does he seem to have given his confidence, except to Rosati; and to Rosati he wrote more than once that the hostility and opposition of his fellow-bishops to every plan or policy he proposed for the betterment of the Church in the United States practically paralyzed his work as an American bishop.

Dr. Kenrick of Philadelphia did not follow a consistent attitude

[19]Cf. Hassard, *Life of Archbishop Hughes*, pp. 176-183. New York, 1866.

towards Bishop England. So long as Dr. England agreed with the Philadelphia prelate, the latter spoke favorably about him in his letters to Rome, but the slightest opposition riled the future Archbishop of Baltimore. Dr. England had been in favor of allowing Bishop Conwell to take a place in the Council of 1833. This Kenrick opposed. Dr. England opposed the division of the Diocese of Philadelphia when it was first proposed by Kenrick in 1835. Kenrick opposed at every turn the possibility of Father Power being named to vacant Sees in the Province. Kenrick was instrumental in blocking Dr. England's transfer to New York,[20] when Bishop Dubois was trying to obtain a coadjutor, though one of Kenrick's letters to Father Hughes would lead the reader to believe that Dr. England was his choice for that post.[21]

On February 26, 1837, Dr. England who was then on his way to Haiti, wrote to Paul Cullen, urging the appointment of Father Power as coadjutor to Dubois. Dubois, he learned, had protested to the other prelates against the transfer of the Charleston bishop to New York, and Dr. England, who suspected the origin of this opposition, told Cullen that Kenrick, who was being spoken of for New York, would never be the man to conciliate the factions in that diocese. "New York is a volcano", England writes, "and Dr. Kenrick is not the man to suppress it." With the appointment of Father John Hughes to the coadjutorship of New York, a situation in that diocese, similar in some respects to that of Philadelphia, was about to be changed for the better. The appointment of Dr. Hughes did not give general satisfaction in New York, and it was some time after his consecration on January 9, 1838, before he won the affection of his clergy. Two weeks after this date Bishop Dubois suffered a stroke of paralysis, and after considerable persuasion he was induced by Archbishop Eccleston to resign the administration of the diocese into Bishop Hughes's hands. Dubois' death (December 20, 1842) brought to a close another pathetic chapter in church administration in this country.

One of the most singular events in the history of the Church in this country is the consecration of St. John's Church at Frederick,

[20]Irish College *Portfolio*, p. 72.
[21]Cf. Hassard, *op. cit.*, pp. 168-169.

Maryland, on April 26, 1837. It would be interesting to know what was the reason which brought the Archbishop of Baltimore and eight of his suffragans to Frederick at the close of the Council to participate in the ceremonies of the consecration. Besides the prelates there was a large concourse of clergymen from all parts of the country, some seventy in all. Certainly no ecclesiastical ceremony had attracted so many personages in all the previous years of the Church here. Father Hughes was to preach, but, as we have seen in Dr. England's letter, owing to the death of his father he asked the Charleston prelate to take his place. One of those who were present gives us his impressions of Dr. England at this time:

> As soon as the gospel was sung by the deacon, the right Rev. Dr. England ascended the pulpit and the word of God was proclaimed for the first time in the temple which had been reared and just consecrated to his greater honor and glory. The sermon was a mild and dignified vindication of the principles of the Catholic faith in connexion with the rites, sacerdotal vesture, language, and ceremonies which are employed in the public worship of God.
>
> The variety of topics on which it was necessary for him to touch in a sermon of this description, would seem unfavorable to what has been regarded as a peculiarity of his mind, more than any other living orator: that is, a power of unfolding a *principle*, and extracting from its development evidences of truth, which sometimes even those who are familiar with the principle do not suspect it of containing, or cannot exhibit with that clearness and perspicuity which carry at once light and conviction to the minds of audiences. When you hear the Bishop of Charleston on a subject of *this* description, you are borne along on a tide which at first may seem barely able to sustain you, but which is continuous and accumulative in its progress until it acquires a force that overwhelms everything which cannot spring to its surface. On such an occasion, he and the advocate of the error he is refuting at the commencement of his discourse, seem to be nearly on an equality, but as he advances you mark the growing strength on one side, and the progressive weakness on the other. He defeats his adversary by the very unfolding of the principles involved in the contest, but when he gathers up his evidences in a concentrated form, and hurls them in their collected weight you see that the opponent is not only defeated but absolutely crushed to the earth, until your sense of pity becomes oppressive, and you would almost interpose for his

rescue. You are so interested in the condition of him who is stricken by the thunderbolts of the Bishop's unerring logic, that at last you become almost insensible to the flashes of an eloquence in the midst of which he launches them forth.

The sermon on this occasion was not, owing to the variety of topics to be treated of, of the description now given. I have listened to him, and always with rapture, and yet I never listened to him with more admiration than in hearing his consecration sermon of the Church of St. John, in Frederick. The sermon lasted one hour and a half, and was listened to with profound attention by the large congregation, who must have been deeply instructed and edified.[22]

As a result of the request made by the Fathers of the Third Provincial Council three new dioceses were erected by the Holy See on July 28, 1837:—Natchez, comprising the State of Mississippi; Nashville, the State of Tennessee; and Dubuque, the State of Wisconsin. Father Thomas Heyden of Pittsburgh was elected Bishop of Natchez, Father Richard Pius Miles, O.P., Bishop of Nashville, and Father Matthias Loras, Bishop of Dubuque. Father Heyden succeeded in escaping the episcopal burden. Father Miles endeavored to do the same, but yielded to Rome's insistence, and was consecrated at St. Rose Convent, Kentucky, by Bishops Rosati, Bruté and Chabrat, on September 16, 1838.[23] Bishop Loras was consecrated at Mobile, on December 10, 1837, by Bishops Portier and Blanc.[24] Dr. England was to have been one of the co-consecrators, but was detained in Charleston on important business. The See of Natchez remained vacant until December 15, 1840, when Father John J. Chanche, President of St. Mary's University, was elected. He was consecrated in the Baltimore Cathedral on March 14, 1841.

Among the other parts of the country considered by the prelates of the Council was the Oregon Territory. While in Rome in March, 1836, Bishop Provencher received jurisdiction over all that part of the American continent west of the Missouri Territory. He understood his jurisdiction to be over the Oregon Territory, then almost equal in size to the original United States.[25] Washington Irving's

[22]Cited in the *Cath. Misc.*, vol. XVI, p. 348.

[23]Cf. O'Daniel, *The Father of the Church in Tennessee, or the Life, Times, and Character of the Right Reverend Richard Pius Miles, O.P., the first Bishop of Nashville*, pp. 231-262. Washington, D. C., 1926.

[24]Cf. De Cailly, *Memoirs of Bishop Loras*, pp. 56-64. New York, 1897.

[25]BCA—Case 27A—W1.

Astoria had attracted American and English attention to the territory which was then in litigation between the two governments. There were few settlers in the territory, but it is significant that our prelates realized that episcopal jurisdiction would soon be needed to protect the interests of the American Church in that section.

Propaganda was kept informed to the smallest detail of all the interests at work in the American Church by Dr. Kenrick, and in one letter, dated April 26, 1837, at the close of the Council, the Bishop of Philadelphia accused Dr. England of intrigue in the matter of the proposed Diocese of Pittsburgh as well as in that of the succession to New York. Dr. Kenrick says that Bishop England seemed intent on two things, to secure Pittsburgh for himself in case that See was erected, and to force Father Power upon the Sacred Congregation as Coadjutor-Bishop of New York. The letter contained sufficient accusations against Dr. England and Father Power to make Propaganda hesitate over the appointments for a long time.[26]

Meanwhile, Bishop Conwell was urging the Holy See to send Kenrick to Nashville and to bring Gallitzin to Philadelphia as his successor. Conwell urged the erection of a See at Wilmington, Delaware, and thought that Father Gallitzin might live there until he succeeded to Philadelphia.[27]

On May 6, 1837, Simon Bruté sent from Cincinnati an equally detailed letter to Propaganda, urging first the erection of the See of Pittsburgh, and nominating Father John Hughes to the same. Dr. England, he believed, should by all means be sent to New York, where a larger field of usefulness awaited a prelate of such unusual capacity. Richmond should be replaced in the American hierarchy, even if Dr. Eccleston, carrying on the Maréchal tradition, should oppose it. The West should be provided at once with a Metropolitan See, even though the Fathers of the Council had preferred postponing the question to the next Council. The vast distances to be travelled by the prelates of the Middle West argued for the necessity of a Second Province in the United States.

Dr. Kenrick wrote to Paul Cullen on May 22, 1837:

---

[26]Prop. Arch., *Scritt. rifer., Amer. Cent.*, vol. 12.
[27]*Ibid.*, fol. 496.

You have doubtless learned from other sources the results of the late Provincial Council. The improved state of feeling which was produced by the courtesy and prudence of the Archbishop, must prove highly gratifying to the Holy See. Dr. England experienced no rudeness, though his measures were not always palatable to his colleagues. I had the misfortune to dissent from him in regard to Dr. Power, who does not appear to me eligible to the Episcopacy. I dissented from most of my colleagues in regard to the privileges of Procurator, and earnestly urged, as did also the pious Bishop of Vincennes, that the Very Revd. Fr. Varela, procurator of the good Bishop of New York, should be allowed to sign the decrees. *Sed diis aliter visum.* Dr. Clancy expressed his desire to be translated, but most of the Prelates thought it inadvisable to interfere in a matter which Dr. England had transacted without their participation. I declined sustaining his nomination or that of Dr. Power for Pittsburgh, and my own nominations were set aside. Rev. J. Hughes would have been nominated for that See, but for the critical situation of New York. I waived all objections, seeing that my colleagues were of opinion that he should be elevated to the Episcopacy, nor did I advert at all in Council to the tone of his letter. His relation to the Church of St. John was the only point which I brought forward, without urging it; though I feel that he should not be withdrawn from a Church actually burdened with $40,000 debt. The mortgages amount to 35,000 dollars.

Poor Dr. R. writes me that he sets out for Rome. An Administrator should be appointed without delay, and Revd. Mr. Odin is the only one on the list eligible. I hope the Congregazione della Missione will not place any obstacle to his appointment. I consented to let my brother's name be placed third, for form's sake, and in the confidence that the first or second, who is a most pious man, would be appointed. Should you perceive any disposition to appoint the third, I beg of you to use all your influence to prevent it. He is my right hand. Revd. Mr. Loras may do good at Dubuque. I am glad that something should be done for Nashville, though I could not approve the nomination of Rev. Dr. Miles, had not Bp. Chabrat given me strong assurance of his piety. The Holy See may hesitate to approve of Father Vandevelde, a Jesuit, for the intended See of Natchez. I am unwilling to change the characteristic features of a Religious Institute, and therefore reluctantly assented. The second, Revd. Thos. Heyden, would have been proposed by me for Pittsburgh if I had sufficient confidence in his decision of character. He possesses respectable talents and a good share of information, and bears an

unblemished character, but sometimes seems to vacillate and is said to want a power of government. His resistance in a particular instance to my authority, and his sullen, insulting letters on the occasion, are long since forgiven him, and he is now placed in the second most important station in the diocese. I could not however urge his promotion to Episcopacy. Revd. W. Whelan is now his assistant in the pastoral charge. I need not tell you "naturam licet expellas furca, tamen usque recurret." My efforts for the erection of the See at Pittsburgh proved ineffectual, the prelates not choosing to adopt into the hierarchy an ecclesiastic inexperienced in the country. I felt the justice of their objection and did not venture to urge my point, as the case of Dr. Clancy strengthened the opposition. An opportunity may soon arise of making a new nomination and the See may be at length erected. For the present I am endeavoring to provide for the wants of this large diocess by ordaining five Priests on Thursday next.[28]

With no statistics available from the three new dioceses (Natchez, Nashville, and Dubuque) the *Almanac* for 1838, gives figures (which appear in the chart on the opposite page) for the Church in the United States.

The year before the Council opened, Texas had declared its independence of Mexico, and by the battle of San Jacinto River (April 21, 1836) won its freedom. The following July, the Texan Government made overtures to the United States for admission into the Union, and, while this did not take place until 1845, Texas was practically a part of the United States. The story of the Church's reorganization in Texas at this time has been recently told, and between 1837 and the next Provincial Council, that of 1840, Texas received its first Prefect-Apostolic in the person of Father John Timon, C.M.[29]

The year of the Third Provincial Council was a comparatively quiet one in the history of what Bishop England has so appositely called in his controversial writings: "The Catholic Question in America." There was no cessation of the anti-Catholic attack from the Protestant press; but other problems, mostly industrial, financial, and political, occupied the mind of America at this time. The three years separating the Second and Third Provincial Councils

[28]Irish College *Portfolio*, pp. 23-26.

[29]Fitzmorris (Sister Mary Angela), *Four Decades of Catholicism in Texas (1820-1860)*. Washington, D. C., 1926.

STATISTICS OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES (1838)

Dioceses	Churches	Other Stations	Clergymen on the Mission	Clergymen otherwise employed	Ecclesiastical Seminaries	Clerical Students	Colleges for young men	Female Religious Institutions	Female Academies	Charitable Institutions
Baltimore	61	10	44	28	3	63	4	3	8	12
Philadelphia	63	8	43	1	1	12	0	0	1	7
New York	38	12	50	0	0	—	0	0	2	5
Boston	18	45	27	0	1	—	1	0	0	1
Detroit	*12	*12	21	—	0	—	2	2	1	5
Cincinnati	24	16	24	3	1	9	1	—	1	2
Vincennes	10	40	20	2	—	—	1	1	1	—
St. Louis	29	46	31	28	2	32	2	9	9	3
Bardstown	*23	—	25	22	2	25	2	6	9	1
Charleston	12	34	14	1	1	7	1	2	2	1
Mobile	*10	—	7	3	—	—	1	1	1	—
New Orleans	24	—	28	—	—	—	—	3	3	2
Natchez										
Nashville										
Dubuque										
15	324	223	334	88	11	148	15	27	38	39

"The numbers marked with an asterisk (*) are not given as strictly exact, though it is believed they approximate to the truth, and are as accurate as could be ascertained from the statements forwarded to the editor from the several dioceses."

saw the rise of the Whigs, and the next three years were to witness the overthrow of the Democrats, to which party the great majority of Catholics had belonged owing to the anti-Catholic tendencies of the Federalists and National Republicans. The revival of anti-Catholic agitation reached a new peak in the next presidential election (1840). Bishop England was to become involved in this political campaign. He was looked up to by Catholics all over the United States as a champion of their rights as citizens. For a score of years he had led the hosts of Catholicism in the Republic by means of his public addresses and his writings. It is to these writings we now turn for a more intimate knowledge of his ability in the field of controversy and of his scholarship as a man of letters and a theologian.

CHAPTER XXXI

Writings of Bishop England

I: 1822-1828

With but very few exceptions all that John England wrote appeared in the pages of the *Miscellany*, either under his own name or under various *noms-de-plume*. There was scarcely a week when the periodical did not contain something from his pen. The issue of April 16, 1842, which gives the account of his death, carried the current number 957. It is no exaggeration to say that no member of the American hierarchy before or since his day wrote upon so many themes and with such uniform scholarship and brilliancy. He wrote with uncommon ease, from a mind well stocked with ecclesiastical literature and with a profound knowledge of the Fathers and of history. His was not a life spent in the quiet of the library. At no period of his life before the Third Provincial Council of 1837 could he count upon a long stretch of days for the composition of a lengthy study on any subject. While all that he had written was of the highest value to the Catholic progress of the time, much of it was necessarily of an ephemeral character. It is noteworthy also that, in spite of his many contributions to the columns of the *Miscellany*, he seldom became journalistic in style or expression. Occasionally, when the attack from the anti-Catholic leaders was viciously personal, he allowed his Irish temperament to rule his pen; and the irony, sarcasm, bitterness, and slashing personal criticisms equalled in their vituperation all he had received from his antagonists.

The larger part of his writings was controversial, though controversy was always distasteful to him. In these especially, there was an ever-present restraint, as though he were constantly on guard. John England was too sanguine a temperament not to display at times his impatience at the ignorance and misrepresentation he found in the writings of those who attacked the Catholic Faith. Uniformly courteous in all his replies to those who entered the lists of controversy with him, he shows in many expressions which escape him

that he hopes for little good to the cause from all the study and hard work these answers demanded of him.

More than once, especially after the anti-Catholic movement had somewhat abated, the suggestion was made to publish his controversial works in a number of volumes. The *Catholic Advocate* of Bardstown printed the following appeal in its issue of January 25, 1840:

> We have been long desirous of seeing published in a connected form all the controversial works of this distinguished Prelate, embracing his Doctrinal Sermons, Letters, Essays, and other miscellaneous productions. In all his writings, there is a clearness, a force, a depth of reasoning, a research, and a power of condensation which few have equalled, and none surpassed. The letters to Blanco White alone form an invaluable repertory of controversial learning. Bishop England has touched almost every subject of controversy, and he has touched nothing which he has not treated clearly, forcibly and satisfactorily.
>
> If the distinguished Bishop of Charleston would make arrangements to have a neat edition of his works aforesaid published by one of our eastern booksellers, we have no doubt that there would be enough copies immediately sold to defray the expenses of publication. We have heard this subject much spoken of, of late, and we think that Bishop England could not do a greater service to religion in the United States, than by taking into serious consideration the present subject.
>
> We should like to see an expression of opinion on this matter, from the Catholic periodical press.[1]

Nothing came of this suggestion and there is every reason to believe that, had he been blessed with years of leisure, Bishop England would himself have rearranged all his writings into a logical series for publication. He died literally with pen in hand; the last of his writings concerned the most difficult and dangerous controversy he had entered—his *Letters on Domestic Slavery*, addressed to the Secretary of State, Hon. John Forsyth.

Several of his works, when completed in the pages of the *Miscellany*, were published in book form, and many of his addresses and letters were immediately issued as pamphlets, as was the custom at that time. The best known of these separate publications is his *Letters Concerning the Roman Chancery*, a celebrated controversy

[1]Cf. *Cath. Misc.*, vol. XVI, p. 255.

between himself and Rev. Richard Fuller, of Beaufort, South Carolina.

Bishop England was constantly being asked to publish his addresses, and the majority of these requests came from non-Catholics. He always hesitated to do this; because, as he admits, his writings were hastily written, as they had to be in the midst of so many pressing duties, without much of that profound research the questions deserved, and they were sometimes as hastily printed as they were written. Dr. England did not look upon anything that had come from his pen as a "finished production." He says in one place that much of what he had imperfectly put into print could be made clearer and stronger, and that "the entire could be greatly and perhaps beneficially abridged".

One of the clearest estimates of Bishop England's power as a controversalist was written a few months after his death by William George Read, of Baltimore, who had been his intimate friend for nearly a score of years. The following passage from Read's short *Memoir* may be cited:

> Bishop England's influence, where he could gain a candid hearing, was irresistible. An illiberal majority was once organized, in the lower house of Legislature of South Carolina, to refuse a charter of incorporation to a Community of nuns, whose invaluable services he was desirous to secure for the education of the female portion of his flock at Charleston. They were a branch of that same admirable Ursuline Order whose Convent had been pillaged and burned, with such unmanly cruelty, in one of our Eastern cities. Some of his friends procured him an invitation to preach before the Senate; and many of the members of the Lower House attended, through curiosity. He spoke of religion, its claims, its obligation. He held up Massachusetts to their scorn. He adverted to the subject of his charter—hurled defiance at them, showed them how he could possess the entire state, for ecclesiastical purposes, had he the means to buy it, despite their narrow souled policy. He exposed to them the folly of driving those of his communion, from the high road of legalized establishments, into the by-paths of the law. He changed his theme, and told of Catholic charity, arrayed before them her countless institutions for promoting the glory of God, and the welfare of man. There was not a dry eye in the house: his bill was passed without a division on the following day!

Before leaving this topic, it may be proper to explain an ex-

pression, adopted advisedly, but which might seem to derogate unjustly from the merits of many of his predecessors and co-laborers; over whom, with all his freedom from the affectation of humility, Bishop England would have been the last to claim precedence. When I style him "the great apostle of this western world", I mean only to say that he was the first to make the Catholic religion respectable in the estimation of the American *public.* The learning, the virtues, the edifying piety of a Carroll, a Nagot, a Du Bourg, a Mareschal, a Flaget, a Cheverus, and others whose names will readily occur to you, had been fully appreciated, admired, and beloved, within the immediate sphere of their personal association. Still their religion, seen through the distorting medium of the literature of England, who in this, as in many other things, still holds us in colonial subjection, was regarded as the hereditary foible of great minds, and pardoned, in their persons, for love of its professors; whose inborn good qualities, transcending the ordinary measure of human virtue, were supposed to have broken through the trammels of what our nursery books taught us to believe to be a cruel, senseless, corrupting, and damnable superstition. Bishop England was the first to dispel this general delusion, and confound the ablest reasoners of America, with his unanswerable expositions of the solid basis of Catholicity, and the deceptive foundation of every other religious system. Followed to the last by admiring crowds, many, whom I could name, "turned back and walked no more after him", not because they considered him the advocate of folly, but because they did not choose to have their imaginary security disturbed, and dreaded lest another hearing should urge them irresistibly to conclusions they were predetermined to abjure. He had shown them too clearly already where was the realm of cold philosophical truth, and where the fairy-land of traditionary credulity. Most of my readers heard him preach and can therefore appreciate, as well as I, those exhibitions of stupendous power, so tempered with gentleness, that, while it struck objectors dumb, never gave offence. If I were to attempt to describe the style of his controversial discourses, I would liken it to a straight bar of polished steel, connecting his conclusion with his premises, with the lighting of heaven flashing and blazing about it. As he was generally invited, when abroad, to preach on the evidence of a Catholic doctrine, an idea prevails extensively that his *forte* lay in that line. This is an egregious mistake. It was when surrounded by an auditory exclusively Catholic, to whom "the reasons of the hope that is in them" were fully known, that, like a father in

the bosom of his family he lavished the riches of his imagination in illustrating the goodness and glory of his God, and poured out in torrents of gratitude and love the abundance of one of the greatest and the kindest hearts that ever beat in a human breast. He reminded me, in his intercourse with other men, whether allies or opponents, of a good humored giant moving among pygmies; whom he was careful not to tread on, but would sometimes dandle playfully between his fingers. I never knew a person who had so much consideration for the errors and prejudices of other men. He knew the mysterious structure of the human mind, and felt that, most frequently, they were more sinned against than sinning. The only class of adversaries for whom he sometimes seemed to forget his usual charity were deliberate liars: and he ranked with these not less the man of sense who reiterates a refuted objection, or advances what he is conscious is a sophism, than the miserable libeller who invents a stupid tale to catch the credulity of the vulgar. His liberality was not limited by the Christian pale. Many of my readers must remember the deep solicitude he felt for the admission to the entire rights of citizens of Maryland of the scattered children of Abraham! and which he expressed in a letter to a gentleman of our own city who had distinguished himself in the Legislature by his eloquent advocacy of their claim.[2]

In many of the tributes to Dr. England's memory received after his death, there is expressed the wish that his works might be collected and published. The Diocese of Charleston remained vacant almost two years after Dr. England's death. When Bishop Reynolds was consecrated second Bishop of Charleston on March 19, 1844, many of Dr. England's friends suggested that the time was opportune for the project. After some difficulty, a complete set of the *Miscellany* was collected, and Fathers Corcoran, Hewit, and Lynch were appointed to go through the twenty-two volumes of the *Miscellany* and to select all those writings which they considered worthy of a place in Dr. England's collected works. The first announcement of the *Works of Bishop England* was made in 1846, in the columns of the *Miscellany;* and in March, 1847, Dr. Reynolds sent out a circular letter to the clergy of the United States urging subscriptions to the project, which was then about to be launched:

Rev. and dear Sir:—I herewith send you a Prospectus of

[2] *Ibid.*, vol. XXII, p. 5.

"Dr. England's Works". My desire of publishing them I announced to the Clergy and people of the Diocese of Charleston more than a year ago; and I should have made this appeal to the friends of Dr. England, and of Religion, at a much earlier period; but for the difficulty and labour of the undertaking, and the almost entire failure of the *promised* aid, on which I had chiefly relied.

I do not flatter myself, that the selection and arrangement of the matter will meet the approbation of all; nor do I presume to think, that the work might not have been better executed under the direction of one having more time and ability for the task, yet I am conscious of having spared no exertion to collect *all* the most valuable writings of my lamented Predecessor, and put them in the form and order, which seemed to me best suited to convenience and usefulness.

I have not undertaken this publication as a tribute to the memory of a great and good man, an eloquent and a learned Prelate of the church—though a sense of what is due to the memory of such a man has animated my efforts. My chief motive has been, to preserve for this and future ages the labours of a writer, well acquainted with the important subjects, which he treated, and singularly gifted with the powers of close and exact logic, and with the happy talent of communicating his thoughts in a style remarkable for perspicuity and strength,—always easy and natural,—often charming by its beauty, or warming by its fervour, and sometimes elevating us by its sublimity. Dr. England possessed in an eminent degree the talent of perceiving, and presenting clearly and prominently to view the principal facts, or most important points in every subject. He had, besides, the admirable tact, if so it may be called, of always marshalling his arguments to the greatest advantage, and of accommodating himself to the circumstances, and spirit of the age, in which we live; thus making every thing available for the great and holy cause, to which he had consecrated his life. The truths of our divine Religion, and the arguments in their proof, always substantially the same, seemed to possess a new beauty and power, to be a sudden and certain intuition of the mind, the vision, as it were, of an inspired man, when announced by the eloquent lips, or laid down and explained by the ready and vigorous pen, of the late Bishop of Charleston. Hence, to those, whose duty it is to inculcate the truths of Religion, his writings may serve as an excellent model, and a motive to increased zeal and industry; while they are a rich repository of matter, generally presented in the manner most fit to produce the desired effect. They are, more-

over, among the first *in time*,—as in merit, of the contributions of the Catholic Church in these States, to Literature, Science and Theology;—are a proof to all of the learning and zeal of our clergy in this, as well as in every other age and country, and contain much, that will aid the future historian of the American Church.

One other consideration has influenced me in preparing this edition of Dr. England's Works; it is, that they cost the author much time and labour, and that for their publication in the ephemeral journals and pamphlets of the day, he thought it right to spend a large portion of the means, which he might have used to promote the interests of Religion in other ways, or to alleviate some of the inconveniences and privations, to which his poverty subjected him. It seems to me, that works which are so valuable, under so many points in view, and which cost the author, whose name we are proud to see on the catalogue of American Bishops,—so much of time and labour, and of the scanty means of poverty itself, *should be preserved;* and the omission of an *effort* at least for this end, might justly be imputed to some want of zeal in those, who are charged with the interests of Religion.

With confidence then, Rev'd and dear sir, I ask not only your individual subscription to the work, but your active zeal in inducing others to subscribe.

It would have afforded me great pleasure to publish my venerated Predecessor's writings at any risk of expense; but I am entirely unable to do so; and notwithstanding their good will, such are circumstances of the few Catholics of this extensive, but poor Diocese, that the publication of the Works of their late, ever loved and lamented Prelate, must depend principally upon their more wealthy brethren in other parts. *The success or failure of the undertaking rests with the Bishops and their Clergy in the United States.* Is it too much to believe, that this very fact promises success?[3]

The *Works of the Right Rev. John England, first Bishop of Charleston, collected and arranged under the advice and direction of his immediate Successor, the Right Rev. Ignatius Aloysius Reynolds, and printed for him in five volumes,* were published by the firm of John Murphy, of Baltimore, and were placed on sale in all the Catholic bookstores in the United States.

In his preface to the first volume, Bishop Reynolds says:

I offer no apology for any portion of the articles here pre-

[3] *Ibid.*, vol. XXVI, p. 317.

sented to the public. Had Divine Providence prolonged his life, Dr. England would certainly have revised his writings with rigorous criticism, before suffering their re-publication, especially, as they were at first prepared under the continual pressure of the many cares and labors of his Episcopate, increased by the embarrassments of poverty. Indeed, when urged by his friends to publish a complete collection of his works, he pleaded the necessity of a strict revision, and the time required for the same, as reasons for postponing the task, He was called away in the prime of life, and in the midst of his usefulness, before reaching that period when, as he had hoped, he might have retired from the active duties of the ministry, and devoted his latter years to a more intimate communion with his Creator, as well as to this, and similar labors. But, though there may be some faults in the style, or deficiency in the matter and arrangement of his compositions, nevertheless, I believe that every thing which Dr. England published, however hastily, or in the severe judgment of his own mind imperfectly written, is worthy of being preserved and read by posterity.

I wished very much to have the quotations and historical references verified, as errors in these matters are easily committed, even by well-informed and honest writers; and this verification was partially made: but our imperfect library, and the many duties of the gentlemen entrusted with the preparation of the work, prevented this being carried through. I am satisfied, however, from the examinations that have been made, and from a knowledge of the accurate mind of Dr. England, that his quotations may be generally relied on.

The Reynolds Edition divided the *Works* of Dr. England as follows:

Part I. *Dogmatic and Polemic Theology.*
Part II. (1) *History: Influence, Political and Moral, of the Roman See.*
(2) *Contributions to the Ecclesiastical History of America.*
Part III. *Miscellaneous.*
Part IV. *Discourses, Pastoral Letters, Addresses and Orations.*
Part V. *General Appendix of Documents.*

A second edition of Bishop England's writings was published in New York in 1900, in two volumes, under the editorship of Hugh F. McElrone, *The Choice Works of the Rt. Rev. John England,*

Bishop of Charleston, S. C., with Memoir, Memorials, Notes, and Full Index.

McElrone says in his preface:

> Cumbered with extraneous matter and badly edited, the first edition of Dr. England's works was speedily exhausted. The object of the present edition is to free his works from those imperfections, and to present them to the public in that shape which the great bishop himself would have chosen had he lived to give the final touches to the children of his brain. Engaged in a succession of controversies, he necessarily reverted to the same subject time and again; consequently many of his articles were mere repetitions, and in these cases the editor has selected that which presents the subject best, fortified by notes from other articles and such sources of information as were within reach. He has also found an immense amount of matter in the 1849 edition, not written by Bishop England, but consisting of newspaper clippings of no interest now, or else of half-digested papers stated to be by other hands. None of this appears in the present edition; every line in it, except the memoir, notes, etc., is from the pen of the great prelate.

McElrone was not a scholar and his edition is not a critical one. Here and there a few obvious footnotes are added, though there is a serviceable index.

In 1908, a third edition of Dr. England's writings was published: *The Works of the Right Reverend John England, first Bishop of Charleston: Edited with Introduction, Notes and Index under the direction of the Most Reverend Sebastian G. Messmer, Archbishop of Milwaukee.* The Messmer edition is in seven volumes. It contains a biographical introduction (pp. xii-xvii) by Rev. P. L. Duffy, of Charleston, South Carolina, and is divided into six parts:

Part I. *Doctrine.*
Part II. *Controversy.*
Part III. *History: General, Ecclesiastical, Historical Fragments.*
Part IV. *Essays.*
Part V. *Occasional Letters.*
Part VI. *Addresses.*

This is a much more logical arrangement than that of the two preceding editions. In preparing the Messmer edition, the merits and demerits of the Reynolds edition were kept in view. A close

analysis of Bishop England's writings, we are told, convinced the editor that his first duty was that of classification:

> With this object in view each article was critically read, subject was compared with subject and individualized ideas were carefully noted. As a result the entire matter was arranged under the following leading divisions: Doctrine, Controversy, History, Essays, Occasional Letters and Addresses. Strict fidelity to the original writings has been the dominating idea of the editor. In realizing this idea many difficulties presented themselves. They arose principally from the fact that nearly all the writings of Bishop England appeared originally in the columns of the *United States Catholic Miscellany*. This publication was founded by the Bishop and for many years edited by him, assisted by several scholarly clergymen. At times the Bishop wrote for the *Miscellany* under a *nom de plume*: again he addressed himself to the public over his own name; now he would choose the form of an explanatory letter or of a pungent rejoinder, and again that of an unsigned essay or historical sketch. Those circumstances were the cause of much perplexity. The known mind of the Bishop, his purpose and his distinctive style were often the sole means of determining his authorship of articles contained in the first edition, but thrown indiscriminately among a great mass of writings never penned by Doctor England. All matter of authorship other than that of Bishop England has been rejected, except where it is necessary for the full understanding of the Bishop's own writing. Following this rule some portions in each of the five volumes of Bishop Reynold's edition have been excluded from the present edition, for instance, the Essays of "Protestant Catholic", and lengthy extract from Bossuet's "History of the Waldenses," the testimonials in the Mattingly case, the bulky correspondence in the Hogan and Harold cases, and so forth. Care has been taken also to remove the newspaper character in which several articles appeared in the first edition. Likewise, it has been deemed advisable to reject the twenty-three notes contained in "Additions" or "Appendices" of the first edition. Several of these notes indicate unusual scholarship and deep research; but they are not the writings of Bishop England; in fact, in many cases, they can hardly be called notes, being rather commentaries either to vindicate his position or to substantiate his assertion, and so forth.

The Messmer edition does not follow a chronological order in its classification of Dr. England's writings. No better way of estimating

the range of these compositions could be given than to catalogue the contents of these seven volumes which make up the 1908 edition:

PART I: Doctrine

1. *Infallibility of the Church* (1825)—Vol. I, pp. 3-56.
2. *Catholic Doctrine of Transubstantiation* (1838)—pp. 57-288.
3. *Tertullian and Transubstantiation* (1824)—pp. 289-299.
4. *Intention and the Sacraments* (1830)—pp. 300-348.
5. *Transubstantiation and Consubstantiation* (1827)—pp. 349-356.
6. *Letters to the Rev. Dr. Bowen on "A Protestant Catechism"*—(1828)—pp. 357-487.
7. *Defence of Letters to Bowen* (1829)—Vol. I, pp. 488-506; Vol. II, pp. 9-168.

PART II: Controversy

1. *Judicial Office of the Church* (1826)—Vol. II, pp. 171-209.
2. *The Vicious Circle* (1824)—pp. 210-212.
3. *Calumnies of J. Blanco White—Letters addressed to the Roman Catholics of the United States of North America* (1826-1828)—pp. 213-562; Vol. III, pp. 9-102.
4. *Catholic Doctrine Misrepresented* (1824-1825)—pp. 104-222.
5. *Controversy with "Mount Zion Missionary"* (1824-1826)—pp. 223-326.

PART III: History

A. *General*

1. *On the Residence of St. Peter in Rome* (1822)—Vol. III, pp. 329-384.
2. *The Pope's Dispensing Power* (1822)—pp. 385-423.
3. *English Ecclesiastical Laws and Privileges* (1827)—pp. 424-451.
4. *The Moral Character of Several Popes* (1822)—pp. 452-518.
5. *History and Doctrine of the Waldenses* (1836-1838)—Vol. IV, pp. 9-27.
6. *The Roman Chancery* (1839)—pp. 28-194

B. *Ecclesiastical*

1. *Bull of the Crusades and Catholicity in North America* (1824)—Vol. IV, pp. 195-255.

2. *The Letter to Lyons. Propagation of the Faith in the United States* (1836)—pp. 256-297.
3. *Early History of the Diocess of Charleston* (1832)—pp. 298-327.
4. *Mother Mary Charles Moloney* (1839)—pp. 328-341.

C. *Fragments*

1. *Denmark*, Vol. IV, pp. 342-346.
2. *Sweden*, pp. 347-353.
3. *Norway*, pp. 354-357.
4. *Russia*, pp. 358-370.
5. *European Turkey*, pp. 371-398.
6. *Greek Schism*, pp. 399-408.

PART IV. Essays

1. *The Republic in Danger* (1831)—Vol. IV, pp. 411-510.
2. *Catholic Voters* (1840)—Vol. V, pp. 9-54.
3. *Vindication of Judge Gaston* (1836)—pp. 55-66.
4. *Catholic Schools* (1822)—pp. 67-74.
5. *The Jansenist Schism* (1826)—pp. 75-79.
6. *Episode of Messrs. Ward and Poinsett* (1826)—pp. 80-87.
7. *Catholic Superstition* (1840)—pp. 88-93.
8. *Ignorance of Catholic Tenets* (1840)—pp. 94-97.
9. *The Term "Catholic"* (1841)—pp. 98-103.
10. *The Religion of the American Indians* (1827)—pp. 104-159.
11. *Descent of Aeneas to the Shades*—pp. 160-182.
12. *Domestic Slavery* (1840)—pp. 183-311.
13. *Ceremonies of the Mass* (1833)—pp. 312-394.
14. *Ceremonies of Holy Week* (1833)—pp. 395-473.
15. *Penitential Austerities* (1824)—pp. 474-500.
16. *Liberality* (1882)—pp. 501-514.

PART V: Occasional Letters

1. *Letter on the Definition of Faith* (1825)—Vol. VI, pp. 9-12.
2. *Letters on Political Measures about Ireland* (1825)—pp. 13-93.
3. *Letters on the Relation of the Catholic Church and Feudalism* (1826)—pp. 94-101.
4. *Letter Concerning the Mattingly Miracle* (1830)—pp. 102-156.
5. *Letters from Rome* (1834)—pp. 157-206.

6. *Letters on N. P. Willis "First Impressions of Europe"* (1833)—pp. 207-226.
7. *Letter to Chancellor Desaussure* (1827)—pp. 227-232.
8. *Pastoral Letters* (1821-1827)—pp. 233-351.
9. *Letter on Civil and Political Duties to the Roman Catholic Citizens of Charleston* (1831)—pp. 352-372.
10. *Letter for the Cathedral of Baltimore* (1839)—pp. 373-375.
11. *Catholic Emancipation in Ireland* (1825)—pp. 376-383.
12. *Letter on Behalf of the Catholic Congregations—which suffered by the Great Fire of Charleston* (1838)—pp. 384-388.
13. *Letters in the Hogan Case* (1822)—pp. 389-486.
14. *Harold Correspondence* (1829-1830)—pp. 487-494.

PART VI: Addresses

1. *Address before Congress* (1826)—Vol. VII, pp. 9-43.
2. *The Nature of Religious Orders* (1833)—pp. 44-65.
3. *Address on American Citizenship* (1841)—pp. 66-75.
4. *Addresses to the Church Conventions of South Carolina* (1824-1838)—pp. 76-191.
5. *Addresses before the Church Conventions of North Carolina* (1829-1831)—pp. 192-200.
6. *Addresses before the Church Conventions of Georgia* (1826-1839)—pp. 201-251.
7. *Addresses to the Conventions of the Diocese* (1839-1840)—pp. 252-279.
8. *Addresses to the Society of St. John the Baptist* (1836-1838)—pp. 280-302.
9. *Address before the Washington Light Infantry* (1838)—pp. 303-336.
10. *Address on Classical Education* (1832)—pp. 337-370.
11. *Address on the Pleasures of the Scholar* (1840)—pp. 371-394.
12. *Address on Epochs of Irish History* (1824)—pp. 395-424.
13. *Address on the Origin and History of the Duel* (1828)—pp. 425-450.

Some of these writings have already been analyzed in this work; and all of them have been used in different parts of the narrative to direct our judgment on various aspects of Dr. England's episcopate. A strictly chronological sequence in the treatment of his writings does not add materially to their proper appreciation. Not all merit

the attention of present-day readers, since the causes and the circumstances of their composition have little if any contemporary value; but there are passages in his larger writings which deserve to be known, not only because of their clarity and logic, but especially because the problems they discuss are of constant interest to American Catholics.

One of the first significant facts in any estimate of John England's works is that, in spite of the conditions under which he prepared these doctrinal, historical, liturgical, and classical papers (conditions which forced a swift gathering of sources and a rapid marshalling of facts into shape for the final draft of his composition), there is a remarkable absence of repetition. A second factor is the range of source-material he used. We have no means of knowing what his library consisted of, for the fire of 1861 destroyed the bishop's house and the seminary. There is frequent mention of the purchase of books in his letters, and it is known that he brought an exceptionally select library of books with him to Charleston in 1820. During his four journeys to Europe, the purchase of books always occupied a goodly share of his time and attention, and he had all the scholar's anxiety about their safe arrival in America. A third aspect of his work is its scholarliness. Writing in an age when the reader did not as a general rule question the sources from which the narrative was constructed, Dr. England never fails to mention the volumes he consulted, and his references are always given with exactitude and fullness. Naturally, this added strength to his pages in such controversies as those he carried on with Bowen, Smith, Hawley, Bachman, Waddell, Fuller, and other Protestant ministers, all of whom had received a classical and theological training of no mean kind.

His first publication was his *Pastoral Letter* of January 21, 1821, a month after his arrival in Charleston, announcing his taking possession of his See. His last publication was his *Address on American Citizenship,* given at Boston on May 14, 1841, on his way to Europe for the last time. In these twenty years, over seventy separate publications were the result of his studies. Some of these were short, such as his letter to Bishop David, *On the Definition of Faith* (March 31, 1825), while others were veritable books in length. Among these are: *The Republic in Danger* (1831), which

occupies 100 pages in his printed *Works; The Roman Chancery* (1839), with 166 pages; *The Catholic Doctrine of Transubstantiation* (1838), his controversy with the Rev. Bachman, which covers 231 pages; and his *Letters to Rev. Dr. Bowen* on *A Protestant Catechism* (1828-1829), with 305 pages. The largest of his writings is the *Letters Addressed to the Roman Catholics of the United States* on the calumnies of J. Blanco White, the notorious apostate, which occupies 442 pages of the Messmer edition.

In the history of the revival of religious intolerance, the period from 1820 to 1850 stands out in startling vividness. The steady current of distrust towards Catholicism as a theology, as a spiritual force, and as a polity in national affairs, had its rise in the century which preceded the coming of the Adventurers to Virginia and Massachusetts. Outside of Maryland for a few decades after the founding of that colony and to a certain extent outside of Pennsylvania, Catholicism or papistry was an object of constant legal surveillance in the charters and statutes of the colonies. Some of the colonies made distinct progress towards the abolition of legal religious repression between the close of the Revolution and the adoption of the Constitution.

There was considerable debate over the extent of the religious freedom guaranteed by the Constitution when it came before the States for adoption; but there was no difficulty in accepting it, since its main purpose was to assert a policy of non-interference in religious affairs by the Federal Government. Theoretically, the restrictions of the first amendment were not binding upon the individual States. Each State had the right to make laws for the establishment of religion within its borders; but, eventually in practice, none deemed it prudent to exercise that right. The principle of religious freedom found its way immediately into some of the State Constitutions; into others it took time before certain disabilities directed against Catholic citizens were entirely removed.

The spirit of the nation was opposed to religious disabilities, and that spirit has not been violated by the Federal Government. In establishing the Northwest Territory (1787); in the legislation for newly acquired lands, such as Louisiana (1803), Florida (1819), Texas (1848), Alaska (1867), and Porto Rico, Guam and the Philippines (1898), the principle of religious equality has been em-

bodied in the treaties which made these territories integral parts of the United States. But in those sections of the original Thirteen States where Protestantism dominated, rights and privileges secured to Catholics for the peaceable enjoyment of their civil and religious freedom were not always respected.

There are several ways of explaining the weary persistence of religious intolerance in the social and political development of the United States. Naturally and logically, to many Catholic writers the pages of our national history which contain evidences of social and political proscription practised against the members of their Church, bear but one interpretation: hatred on the part of many Protestants for the ancient Faith of Rome. To other students of American social history, the explanation is sought in the racial antagonism of the Anglo-Saxon towards all foreigners and especially towards the Irish, who were for so many years after the founding of the new republic the principal element in the growth of the nation by immigration. So many confusing factors enter into what might be called the Protestant attitude towards Catholics that it is practically useless to attempt anything like a logical analysis of that prejudice. In some sections where it was a highly tinged industrial animosity, it has a specious justification on economic grounds. In other parts of the country, particularly in the growing cities of the East, the prejudice was partly social and partly political; and here again, a calm examination of all the aspects of the anti-Catholic spirit of some of our cities reveals causes within the Catholic ranks which could not fail to provoke misrepresentation and sturdy opposition. In intellectual centres, such as Princeton, New Haven, and Cambridge, the anti-Catholic viewpoint was of a different nature, and less likely to promote outbreaks of a violent kind. If we allow ourselves to make the conclusion that the abettors of this violence enter into the causal elements of this anti-Catholic spirit, then to the ministry of certain Protestant Churches must the charge be laid that, without the fanaticism they deliberately engendered by their speeches, sermons, and published articles, the malice and hatred of the mobs which enacted so much violence would not have blackened the fair name of American justice and liberty.

American Protestantism hated the Church of Rome with an uncommon hatred during the first fifty years of the nineteenth century.

Rev. Lyman Beecher in Boston, Rev. Dr. Brownlee in New York, Rev. Robert J. Breckinridge in Baltimore, and Rev. Richard Fuller in Beaufort, South Carolina, are among the outstanding names in any history of the movement. To these clergymen might be added many in every part of the United States who believed, and probably with sincerity, that the future prosperity of the nation was jeopardized by the increasing power, influence and numerical strength of the Catholic Church.

If the causes, however, for this hostility are so varied and so sectional in character that an accurate synthesis is almost unobtainable, the efforts of Protestant intolerance are so objective in their undisguised purpose that there need be no hesitancy in acknowledging them. That purpose was the extermination of Catholicism in the country and the control of the Government through political methods for the Protestantizing of the American people.[4]

The outbreaks against Catholics before 1829 were sporadic and occasional in character, and are to be attributed to local conditions, especially in the large cities where the influence of Catholic immigrants arriving in the United States was more noticeable. The Catholics numbered in 1829 about five hundred thousand in a total population of twelve millions. Their opponents were conscious of their numerical strength; they themselves knew the weakness, from a political viewpoint, inherent in the Catholic group. Catholics were, therefore, forced to assume outwardly a political attitude which made them appear a compact body, well organized and anti-Federalist to a man, owing to the religious prejudices aroused in the elections of 1824 and 1828. John Gilmary Shea in his own personal memories is a link between the intense anti-Catholic period of 1829-1844 and our own day. He knew better than any other historian of the Church here the vivid spirit of the newcomers from Ireland. It was freedom they sought in America—freedom for their Faith, for which their fathers had so gloriously suffered in the centuries preceding Catholic Emancipation; freedom, too, for an equal chance with their fellowmen to wrest from life a modest competency and legitimate comfort, and freedom to live their own lives with their children about them, and their priests near at hand to watch over their

[4]Condon, *Constitutional Freedom of Religion and the Revivals of Religious Intolerance*, in the *Hist. Rec. and Studies*, vol. IV (1906).

spiritual welfare. That they found this freedom in all its attractive aspects can hardly be sustained by historical proof. But they respected the liberty enshrined in the Constitution and in the laws of the land. The freedom granted to them, Shea says, was never abused:

> They had borne their part with their fellow-citizens in developing the resources of the country, increasing its wealth and prosperity; they had marched shoulder to shoulder with the bravest toward the Indian foe or the foreign enemy; they had no share in the secession plans of the Northwest or the revolutionary plans of the Southwest. They had erected churches, colleges, academies, and schools for the religious, moral and intellectual training of their members; they were caring for the orphans. There was nothing in their record to afford a basis for any revival of the ancient spirit of persecution and oppression. It is not to be wondered at that Catholics lived in the feeling of perfect security, relying on the protection of the laws. Yet there was a steadily increasing current of thought hostile to them in the country, nurtured mainly by publications from the British Isles, a strong anti-Catholic literature evoked by the agitation in favor of Catholic Emancipation. Many of these things were reprinted here and widely circulated; old prejudices were revived, and the unscrupulous soon found that new contributions would be readily welcomed without too close scrutiny. To meet these constant misrepresentations and calumnies, it had been found necessary to establish Catholic journals. The earliest of these, the *United States Catholic Miscellany*, the *Truth Teller*, the *Jesuit*, devoted much of their space to the defense of Catholic doctrines and the refutation of false and malicious charges; controversies increased, but produced little benefit, and the converts who entered the Church were not won by them; in almost every case they were men and women who found that the systems in which they had been educated lacked a logical basis, and who came by study, thought, and prayer to the portals of the Catholic Church. Meanwhile the anti-Catholic feeling was gaining ground steadily, and becoming, though no one seemed to comprehend the fact, a menace to the peace and harmony of the country, without one redeeming element, but fraught with a dangerous disregard of the rights of fellow-citizens to life and property. This dangerous condition pervaded the whole country, encouraged and stimulated by men

who professed the most religious principles, but which needed only a pretext to burst out into open violence.[5]

The victory of the Anti-Federalists in the election of Andrew Jackson is a prominent factor in the history of Catholicism in the United States. Catholics, especially the Irish, rejoiced in the triumph of a party opposed to the naturalization plans of the Federalists; and there was undoubted satisfaction in the defeat of a man who represented Puritan prejudice and who, even as President, seemed unable to overcome his anti-Catholic bias. Jacksonian democracy meant also a larger share in government by the people. Calhoun, of South Carolina, as Vice-President, represented the older democracy once led by Jefferson, and in the meeting of this older democracy with the self-reliant spirit of equality from the frontier it was expected that a new era for the common man, in which equality would be the reigning policy, had set in. Jackson and Calhoun were temperamentally opposite in character, and their union lasted too short a time to produce unanimity between the Northern and Southern politicians of the party. After their break (May 30, 1831), the South, with South Carolina and Calhoun at its head, began the agitation on the nullification issue. All other issues in the South, even the religious, then became subordinate to the spirit of secession.[6] In the North, the social and political conditions were of a different nature, and the religious forces that had been so seriously awakened in the decade before 1825, now began to group themselves together into organizations with anti-Catholic aims.

Dr. England's *United States Catholic Miscellany* was bound to attract the attention of the antagonists of the Church in the North as well as in the South. All other Catholic weeklies or monthlies under Catholic editorship had been largely devoted to the cause of Irish religious and political freedom. John England's purpose was to found a newspaper in which simply and temperately the doctrines of the Catholic Faith would be explained.

It was a bold venture for the bishop of the poorest and weakest of the American dioceses. All through the twenty years of his editorship Dr. England strove to keep those two words before his mind, *simply* and *temperately*. But it was a losing fight from the begin-

[5] *Op. cit.*, vol. III, pp. 419-420.
[6] Cf. Fish, *Development of American Nationality*, p. 205.

ning. Those who, simply and temperately, desired to know what the doctrines of the Church were, were not of the class to indulge in controversy. The *Miscellany* quickly became the object of Protestant and particularly of Presbyterian attacks, and within a short time after its inception, its columns fairly bristled with replies to anti-Catholic diatribes from all quarters.

If Dr. England had any hope of keeping the *Miscellany* on the higher ground of intelligent and honest theological discussion, he was soon disillusioned. He did not know the ignorance, culpable as well as inculpable, with which he had to deal.

In one of the first numbers, that of the Fourth of July, 1822, he asserted that to no class of American citizens should the national holiday be more welcome or contain greater cause for joy than "the Roman Catholics of this Union". To them, indeed, more than to any other, the Declaration of Independence had brought blessings. Previous to 1776, here, as in Great Britain, they were the objects of scorn and persecution, here, as well as in Great Britain, they were misrepresented and calumniated, and here their situation was far worse than even in Great Britain.

> The full measure of wrath and malediction was poured upon them, and not a particle of the balsam of charitable commiseration was applied to heal the scalded, blistered and agonized victims, because the colonies were abundantly supplied with tracts and fables, stuffed with the grossest falsehoods, representing this people as worse than fiends, and more ignorant and brutish than any other species of idolaters. The Pope was an old rogue, who had a respectable pair of horns; the city of Rome was a great big lady of pleasure, patched and painted and drunk and dressed in scarlet. The people of Spain were perpetually burning heretics; the French wore wooden shoes, which were one day to serve them as canoes, in which, they were to be conveyed across the straits of Dover, for the purpose of eating up the King of England and the Archbishop of Canterbury. And the Irish papists had tails, but we are not informed, whether they were more like those of bulls, or of monkies. A people, viewing the Roman Catholics through the medium of such communications, could not be expected to feel well disposed towards them. In England, some opportunities were occasionally afforded to correct these unwarrantable impressions, which had been made upon the minds of big and little children, in the alms-houses and in the nurseries, in the

> churches and in the schools. But no such opportunities existed in the colonies, if we except a portion of Maryland. The American people, strongly attached to England, followed the very prejudices of that nation; until, driven to examine, to reflect, and to reason, they discovered their own rights, and asserting them, they discovered the rights of others and conceded them. The correct reasoning of the American mind, when it had disengaged itself from the prejudices with which it had been fettered, brought it at the very formation of its constitution to do instantly an act of plain justice and political wisdom, which the parent country, after a lapse of nearly fifty years, has not yet had the magnanimity to perform.[7]

Practically all the objections against the Church here were echoes of similar discussions in England. In many of the earlier issues of the *Miscellany*, Dr. England had but to repeat the rebuttals given in such newspapers as the *English Catholic Miscellany* and other publications edited by English and Irish Catholics. Wherever it was possible, he published temperate views on Catholic doctrines from Protestant sources. Time and patience, he believed, would bring the doctrines of the Church out from the fog in which the seventeenth century had blanketed them. If he had been free, religious controversy would never have been given a place in the columns of the *Miscellany;* but when newspapers, avowedly anti-Catholic, began the attack upon the *Miscellany*, he felt that he owed it to his readers to enter the lists.

Once begun, he never faltered and never yielded his post. It was a day when no quarter was asked or expected between controversialists; and the mass of libellous invective against the Church was in reality so huge in proportion to the whole content of the American press of the day that some one had to throw himself into the breach. In this regard, Dr. England's twenty years of editorship would have been enough work for one man.

Generally speaking, all Dr. England's writings during the twenty-two years of his episcopate belong to the literature created by the anti-Catholic movements of this epoch. Lack of space will not permit the analysis of more than a tithe of Bishop England's writings. Those which are discussed in this and the following chapter, have been chosen on account of their application to questions of Catholic

---

[7] *Cath. Misc.*, vol. I, p. 328.

doctrine and of political philosophy that are mooted in our own day by opponents to Catholicism in the United States.

The first of these anti-Catholic attacks was a diatribe from the Washington, D. C., *Gazette*, against the morality of some of the sovereign pontiffs. This led to a series of papers written by Dr. England under the pseudonym of "Curiosity", entitled *On the Moral Character of Several Sovereign Pontiffs*. Dr. England was dealing with an opponent whose platform was a popular one in Protestant ministerial circles of the time: "I would treat the Roman Catholic Church like a man who has been convicted of perjury, I would not believe her, though she spoke the truth."[8] There was apparently little use in replying to the charges of wrong-doing made against the Popes in the past, but "Curiosity" began with the issue of August 21, 1822, and took up in turn each of "those Popes who would have been a disgrace to a Newgate Calendar," as the *Gazette* styled them.

At the same time the *Gospel Advocate* of Boston contained an attack on the *Miscellany* by "One of the People in the South." The point at issue was the dispensing power of the Popes. In the issue for November 20, 1822, Dr. England published the letter addressed to the *Advocate* and began a skilful and able refutation of the charges made against this power and its alleged misuses. During 1824, the *Mount Zion Missionary*, one of the principal religious journals of Georgia, took up the fight against Dr. England on the theme: "Republicanism and Catholicism bear no affinity in any one single relation, nor can they ever cordially unite in character."

This slogan crystallizes almost all the phases of the anti-Catholic movements in the United States. The various elements involved, political, racial, industrial, and religious, found in this rallying cry the clearest exposition of their fears of Catholicism. In the Hughes-Breckinridge controversy of 1833 and in the Purcell-Campbell controversy of 1837, the problem was the same: "Is the Roman Catholic Religion, in any or all its principles or doctrines, inimical to Civil Religious Liberty?"

"Would that we had to do with antagonists", exclaims Dr. England in his controversy with the editor of the *Mount Zion Missionary*, "who would print only the truth! But the torture, the affliction of being perpetually occupied in an Augean stable, in which all the

[8] *Works* (Reynolds), vol. II, p. 441.

imported falsehoods of European writers of these centuries are deposited!"

The answer given to the charge made by the *Mount Zion Missionary* that the Catholic Church, believing in a union of Church and State, was striving to control the American Republic, was that the Protestant bodies, in particular the Baptist and Presbyterian, were guilty of a crowning inconsistency in their own action by trying to do secretly the very thing they openly condemned. Dr. England answered the charge as follows: "There is not on earth a body of clergy who have uniformly endeavoured to create this union in their own person with more steady energy than those of one of the Protestant communities."[9]

Another attack came from the *Theological Repertory*, a periodical published in Washington, D. C., by a group of Protestant Episcopal clergymen. The Rev. William Hawley, its editor, had made several attacks on Catholic doctrine. In the issue of November, 1824, appeared an article headed *Roman Catholic Doctrines.* Dr. England replied to these misrepresentations of Catholic principles in the *Miscellany* for 1824-1825, in a series of *Letters on Various Misrepresentations of the Catholic Religion.* He writes:

> In this happy country Protestants and Catholics are united in bonds of unity, their intercourse is unrestrictedly affectionate. I, therefore, am totally at a loss for any reason why you and writers of your description, should be so anxious, and so unremitting in your endeavours to interrupt this harmony, to create jealousy, to produce in America the miseries of European dissensions. The Roman Catholic Church of America has too long permitted herself to be assailed with impunity by every essayist in an unmeaning religious cant; it is time to exhibit their deformity. You must show, not by declamation, but by facts, in what your church has been offended by ours in these United States, or you stand convicted of having attacked an unoffending church... Good God! Then is America fallen so low? Is her intellect so debased? Are these states become such a sink of ignorance, as that all the rejected falsehoods of Europe are to find this as their asylum? Are we, who have led the way in the career of rational well-regulated liberty, to crawl after the bigots of Europe, sucking in what they disgorge, that we may vomit it upon each other? I protest. I cannot describe my feelings whilst I write; I thought that I had flung the

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 289.

Atlantic between me and this necessity. I imagined that the testimony of George Washington would have had weight with the people of this Union. I did hope that the recollection of Archbishop Carroll was not blotted away altogether. I am now to be informed that Charles Carroll has forfeited the good will of our country, has betrayed his sacred honour, has snatched his pledged property from the perils of the contest for freedom, or has shamefully skulked from facing the enemies of his country in the day when his services were needed. No! we will be told there is a sufficient explanation of this: The only reason why, among Papists, there are many good Subjects of Protestant Governments arises from the fact, that there are so many in the Roman Church *inconsistent with their profession*, better than their profession; having no idea of all the doctrines and all the enormous corruptions of the faith which they acknowledge... and pray, sirs, call you this a compliment?... I really must repeat, I know not how to write upon so disgusting a collection of arrogant insulting calumny. I must pause to ask, What has provoked it? I do know many virtuous, amiable, excellent Protestants. I believe the doctrines of their church to be erroneous in many instances. But if I know myself, I would sooner be deprived of my tongue or of my fingers, than address to any one of them such a gross insult. I do not know, I never did know, any Protestant friend of mine to be as good as his church taught him to be. His church teaches a very high and exalted morality. And when, in a friendly way, I discuss with him topics of doctrine, I do not find it necessary to calumniate and to insult him. If Mr. Hawley and his associates have no better foundation for the support of their system than the ignorance or vice of some of those men to whom their Protestant neighbours would give honourable testimony for virtue and information, their base is tottering indeed. But, sirs, what do you mean by calling America a *Protestant* country? Do you mean a Protestant Episcopalian country? Do you mean to insinuate that the *government* of America must be Protestant? Do you mean to insinuate, no Papists shall be allowed to live under these Protestant Governments? If this be not your meaning your argument is worth nothing, for your statement is, that Papists cannot be good Subjects of Protestant Governments. I know of only *two Protestant governments* in the United States, viz., New Jersey and North Carolina. Yet in those states are to be found some Roman Catholic citizens who are amongst the best informed and most meritorious citizens of our Union; men beloved and respected by their Protestant fellow-citizens; and I would not so far in-

sult them, as to say their oaths would be considered as good a pledge as would the Rev. Wm. Hawley's. Thank God, sirs, I know many of the members of the Protestant Episcopal Church, who will be amongst the first to clip your wings should you aspire to create an established church or a dominant church; and, sirs, you must be reminded, that Congress had no power to make any law respecting the establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof. This is then, sirs, as much a Presbyterian country, as much a Baptist country, as much a Unitarian country, as much a country of the Israelite, and of the Roman Catholic, and of the Methodist, as it is of the High Churchman.[10]

Hawley, in rebuttal, went a step further in his charges, which he outlined as follows:

1. A Roman Catholic can be *in principle* a faithful subject of a Protestant government, only when an *unfaithful subject* of the Pope.
2. A consistent Papist, and a dutiful subject of a Protestant administration, must be incompatible, so long as the Pope shall claim jurisdiction over all Christendom, and the Roman Church shall continue to maintain that faith is not necessary to be kept with heretics.

Dr. England lost patience when such statements came from a clergyman who was then chaplain to the United States Senate; and in several columns of unimpeachable sarcasm he brought out into historic relief the opposition between Hawley's statements and the very essence of American freedom, which abhorred such religious slavery as that expressed in Hawley's words: "Whoever will not be a Protestant under a Protestant government is a traitor!" A paragraph from Dr. England's answer will suffice to show the general treatment he accords the chaplain:

I am proud of America, because America not only disavows, but condemns that principle of Slavery. It is a heresy in religion; it is an absurdity in politics, to assert that because a man possesses political power, therefore he possesses ecclesiastical jurisdiction: or that because he has spiritual power, he therefore has magisterial rights in the state. The doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church and the principles of the American Constitution are in unison upon this subject. The doctrines of the Church of England and the principles of our constitution

[10] *Ibid.*, pp. 213-276, *passim.*

> are in direct opposition upon the subject. And if you adopt the doctrine of the English Church, you are not good citizens of America. In framing the religion of which you are clergymen, it became necessary to reject some doctrines of the English Church. Her liturgy was mutilated; her canons made useless; and a vast portion of the homilies are blasphemies against our liberties. And is it possible that you still cling to all that has been thus rejected?[11]

At this stage of a controversy which had attracted the attention of official Washington, Dr. England gave the doctrine on this phase of Church and State as explained by Catholic theologians; namely, that

> God never gave to any Pope, nor to any other bishop, nor to any other clergyman, nor to any human tribunal, any power, directly or indirectly, to inflict any corporal or temporal punishment upon man for heresy or religious error. He did give to the Church, and of course to the Bishops who compose her tribunal, a power to cut off delinquents by excommunication, a power to censure, to deprive of spiritual authority, to refuse the sacraments and such like. But He never gave to the Church any other power of punishment.

Bishop England was to find, however, to his own constant amazement that no disavowal could influence the Protestant mind on this subject. There is much in habit, he tells Hawley, in conclusion:

> The people of America have been accustomed to find Roman Catholics treated in the manner that you have treated us. But, sirs, if I were to write of Protestants as you have written of Catholics, would any vituperation be considered too gross. You deserve worse treatment than you have received. I have been too lenient, too sparing. But should it be necessary for me to take you up again, do not calculate upon such forbearance. I stand in America upon an equality of right with you; and though I have against me vast prejudice, for which the people of America are not to blame: I have to contend in presence of a discerning, intelligent, patient, investigating people who love truth and will neither strike me down by the hand of power, nor drown my voice in clamour. They are not like the British Parliament, who put the lock of the law upon the mouth of truth.

An article in the *North American Review* of July, 1824, on the

---

[11] *Ibid.*, p. 249.

state of the Catholic Church in South America, next attracted Dr. England's attention; and in the *Miscellany* for 1824, he replied at length to the charges of the *Review*. But after many pages of refutation, in which he displayed an uncommon knowledge of South American history, he concluded:

> In a country like this, which has been nursed in prejudices against our creed, where, until very lately, except in a few of the principal cities, a well-informed Catholic could scarcely be found, and where everything in early education and after-reading was calculated to impress the youthful mind that our religion was a system of slavish delusion, groaning under the tyrannical sway of an ignorant, arrogant, and corrupt priesthood, leagued with the most unprincipled despots; that its component parts were superstition and persecution; that its characteristics were avarice and profligacy, chiefly exhibited in gross simoniacal traffic of pardons for all sins past, present, and to come, in exchange for money; in a country where the press, the fashion, the usages, and the historical recollections and family affections were all in arms against us, not twenty years since, it would not be expected that the mind would be free to form a correct, an unbiased judgment in our case.[12]

During 1825 he published in the *Miscellany* a series of letters on the *Infallibility of the Church*. An inquirer wrote from Savannah under the pseudonym "Truth" in May, 1825:

> I have recently been one of the numerous auditors of the Rt. Rev. the Bishop of Charleston, while on his visit to this city. His eloquent reasonings have done much towards removing my early prejudices against the Roman Catholic Church; but, before I could fully and freely adopt its faith, there are some questions which I could wish the Bishop, or some competent authority, would solve, through the medium of your paper. These questions relate to the *Infallibility of the Church*. By this, am I to understand a moral certainty that what the Church, in all ages, has held as Christian doctrine, must be such? Or, am I to believe, that by virtue of the infallibility of the Church, what are now her doctrines must have been so from the beginning? If it be the former, I would embrace it with all my heart, and should in no case require a better proof of any article of Faith, than to be shown a sufficient evidence that such an article was held by the Catholic Church in the beginning. But, if it be the latter, I should be gratified to be shown the

[12] *Ibid.*, vol. III, p. 219.

evidence, upon which my belief is required, that such infallibility is an attribute of the Church.[13]

In answer to this inquiry, Dr. England made the general statement that "the Doctrine of our Church regarding her infallibility is generally misrepresented by her controversial opponents and misunderstood by most of our separated brethren." He lays down a first principle "that man is not bound to believe any doctrine as of faith, unless that doctrine has been revealed by God."

"We want an infallible guide", Dr. England says, "and the Bible is not and cannot be that guide; because, although it contains the Words of Truth, those words are susceptible of contradictory interpretations, and, in fact, are interpreted contradictorily." He then advances his argument by two series of numbered facts, thirty-three in all, in the first of which he proves that the Church has existed from the time of Christ, has received its doctrine from Christ, and has never changed that doctrine. In the second series of facts, he proves the Church's inalienable right to interpret the Scriptures, and from these facts he deduces eight conclusions, which may be given here as a specimen of his method:

1. That Christ did not establish as the mode of knowing his doctrines, the publication of Bibles, and leaving to individuals to interpret them as they thought fit; or—what is but a modification of the same—establish those individuals as judges, to know from Bible-reading whether the teacher gave them his doctrine or not.
2. That he sent teachers, to whom the people were to listen, and from whom and upon whose authority, the people were to receive his doctrine.
3. That this authority of theirs was approved by miracles, and therefore had the sanction of heaven.
4. That it was by its exercise nations were converted and truth preserved.
5. That it is only by its recognition we can know what Scripture contains the Word of God.
6. That without its recognition we have no certain knowledge that the New Testament contains the doctrines of Christ.
7. That if it be a fallible tribunal in what concerns faith, we have no certainty that the books which we receive are inspired, and that those which we reject are not God's word.

---

[13] *Works* (Messmer), vol. I, pp. 3-4.

8. Therefore: if the great body of the teachers of the Church cannot give us with infallible certainty the doctrines of Christ, we have no certainty that these doctrines are contained in the New Testament, or are now taught anywhere in the world.

Let us take, he says, another view of facts.

1. There was a Christian Church before there was a Christian Bible.

2. That Church was organized, and perfect, and widely spread abroad, before one particle of the Christian Bible was written.

3. It was upon the authoritative testimony of that Church that the Bible was received.

4. If that testimony had not been given, no person would have any certainty that the book, which was selected from several scattered writings, contained the Revelation of God to man.[14]

Hence he concludes that if the Catholic Church was not infallibly correct in giving this decision and testimony, we have no infallibly certain foundation for our Faith. If the Church is not infallible, then men have no certainty what God has taught, and Scriptures cannot be distinguished "from foolish and blasphemous forgery". Unless this conclusion is accepted, Dr. England says, then we must accept one or the other of the following propositions:

(1) It is now impossible to know with certainty what Christ has taught.

Or (2) It is from the Catholic Church we will know with infallible certainty what God has revealed.

Or (3) Every individual who reads the Bible with good dispositions will infallibly know that his dispositions are such as will insure to him a knowledge of truth; also he will be infallibly correct in ascertaining what books contain the word of God, and also, the full meaning of all the passages of those books.

Or (4) Although the Roman Catholic Church may err, and individuals may err, yet a particular body will give us with infallible certainty a knowledge of what God has revealed, and that body is ——.

Each reader is at liberty to fill the blank as he pleases.

If we support the first proposition, we destroy faith. If we maintain the third, we shall have to reconcile myriads of contradictions. We do not know any one who will maintain the fourth. Therefore the second must be true, or our distinctive

[14] *Ibid.*, pp. 12-13.

proposition is inaccurate. We shall believe it to be accurate until it shall be amended by giving us some fifth proposition.[15]

"Truth" wrote in reply to Dr. England's first letter: "Your essays upon infallibility have been read with attention, as they have appeared, and I confess my scruples, though not wholly removed, are reduced within a very narrow compass. The distinctive definition of what is meant by infallibility is not given so clearly as I could have wished. The point of the essays seems rather to be turned to the necessity than to the definition of this attribute". The difficulty was not yet solved for "Truth". "How am I", he writes, "to become infallibly assured that this attribute belongs only to that body of Christians who maintain external communion with the Church of Rome, as their head; for infallibility can profit me as an individual but little, unless I have indubitable assurance as to its location and the body to which it belongs by divine communication. In other words, it must be made infallibly certain, that the Church of Rome, or rather the Roman Catholic Church, is the organ of Christian infallibility; or else I come short of the necessary evidence to establish my faith."

To this question Dr. England answers with such clarity and precision that "Truth" withdrew from the correspondence. These letters in themselves are valuable for the profound philosophical grasp they display on the problem of certitude. As a first essay into the field of controversy, they were sufficient indication to those who regarded the *Miscellany* as the doctrinal voice of the Church in the United States, that its editor would not be found wanting in knowledge and in courtesy, should they bring their theological problems to its pages.

The next controversy was that with the Rev. Hugh Smith, rector of the Protestant Episcopal Church of Augusta, Georgia. Mr. Smith preached the opening sermon at the Convocation of the Episcopal Church of Macon, Georgia, and made the customary attack on Popery. Dr. England answered Smith during 1826 in the *Miscellany*, endeavoring in vain to keep the controversy to the field of the theological discussion.

Here again he met with disappointment. No amount of explanation seemed to have any appreciable effect upon the columns of the

[15] *Ibid.*, p. 20.

Protestant American press. He says in the course of his extended essay: "I am tired of enumeration. My object was to show how it was morally, I was about to say, physically impossible for any American Protestant, however high his rank, exalted in mind, extensive his reading, or comprehensive his charity, to be free from violent prejudice against Catholics at the period of the Revolution, just fifty years ago." What made his heart sore was that the half-century of freedom in America had changed so slightly the animus against the Catholic Faith, and that all these and other controversial writings were not clearing the way faster for a better harmony between Protestantism and the Catholic Faith in America.

Dr. England's largest controversial work *On the Calumnies of J. Blanco White* ran through the years 1826-1828 in the *Miscellany* and was later published in book form. Blanco White was the most notorious apostate priest of his day. He was the grandson of an Irishman named White, who had become the head of a large business concern in Seville. The family changed the name to Blanco. Joseph was born at Seville on July 11, 1775. At the age of twelve he began his studies preparatory to the priesthood and was ordained in 1800. As Dr. England has shown from White's own published works, his private life before and after ordination was an unworthy one. For ten years he remained in the priesthood in various posts, though at heart he was an infidel. In 1810, he left Spain for England, and spent the remainder of his life (he died in 1841) in England and Ireland. After settling in England he added White to his name, and henceforth was known as J. Blanco White. He proclaimed himself an infidel, but in 1812 joined the Anglican Church and went to Oxford to study theology in order to become an Anglican clergyman. There and in London he made the acquaintance of the leaders in the Anglican fold, and at Oxford was on intimate terms with Newman, Pusey, Hurrell Froude, and Whately who later became Archbishop of Dublin. Blanco White's *Letters from Spain* under the signature of "Doblado" which were first printed in 1821-1822 in the *New Monthly Magazine,* were published in book form in 1822, and later in 1825, over his own name. These letters won for him immediate literary recognition, and his career from this time is rather that of a spoiled child of his Anglican friends. In spite of the unpleasant moral side of his character, Blanco White is credited

with a sweetness of character which is evidenced by the warmth and endurance of his friendships. He entered the field of polemical theology in his attack upon Charles Butler in 1825. Butler had replied to Robert Southey's *Book of the Church*, in his *Book of the Roman Catholic Church*, first published in 1825. In his *Reminiscences*, Charles Butler enumerates ten replies to his own *Book*, among them those by Bishop Philipotts of Exeter, Bishop Jewel of Salisbury, Bishop Blomfield of Chester, and the work of Blanco White, entitled: *Practical and Internal Evidence against Catholicism with strictures on Mr. Butler's Book of the R. C. Church*, which came out in 1826.[16]

The English controversy was transplanted to America, when Bishop Kemp of Maryland and a group of Protestant ministers of several Churches recommended the work of Blanco White as "a temperate and able exposition of errors of Popery". This determined Dr. England to publish his series of *Letters to the Roman Catholics of the United States*, the first of which appeared on September 4, 1826. In his opening letter Bishop England gives us a clear insight into the causes of the religious prejudices existing at the time against Catholicism:

> I am a native of Ireland, but a citizen of America, and of course, have resided during several years in this Union. I am a Roman Catholic; and one of the principal inducements which operated on my mind in preferring this to any other part of the world was, not merely the excellence of its political institutions, but, as I flattered myself, the absence of bigotry. I was led to believe that, although men differed from each other in religion, yet when there was no profit or preference to be obtained by acrimony, I should not meet with any. I was also led to think the American mind was candidly and sincerely occupied in searching after truth; and that, as it was given to investigation, it would speedily arrive at its discovery. I must confess, that I have been disabused of some part of my error. I found there was in the general constitutions of most of the States, a principle which restrained men from being tyrants over the conscience of their neighbor, but that neither law nor constitution had effected what I now find cannot be produced by mere political regulation, that cordial and af-

[16]Cf. Haille-Bonney, *Life of Lingard*, p. 202; cf. Thom, *Life of the Rev. Joseph Blanco White* (London, 1845); *Dict. Nat. Biog., s. v.* "White."

fectionate feeling which is the result of true charity for each other, amongst men who differ in religious belief. I found what I was altogether unprepared for; that, in many of our States, a Roman Catholic, though legally and politically upon a level with his fellow-citizens, was however too often looked upon, by reason of his religion, as in some degree morally degraded. I found that it was by no means considered a want of liberality, on the part of Protestants, to vilify the Catholic religion, and to use the harshest and most offensive terms when designating its practices; but that if a Catholic used any phrase however modified, which even insinuated any thing derogatory to the Protestant religion, he was marked out as a shocking bigot, and his offence was unpardonable. The newspapers, I perceived, were generally stuffed with extracts and articles which were offensive to Catholics; but the editors were very careful not to bring a hornet's nest about their ears by inserting a paragraph offensive to any Protestant society. I had frequent opportunities of conversing with polite and well-informed Protestant gentlemen, and they, though knowing my religion, used the most offensive phraseology when speaking of our Church or our institutions, being, I am convinced, totally unconscious that the language which they used was originally constructed to offend us. They spoke to me of the *Romish* Church, and of *Popish* priests, and of *Romish* bishops, and *adoration* of images, as undisguisedly as if they were not using the most insulting language. I knew they meant nothing unkind; I had abundant evidence of their good will; yet, though I felt that it would be indelicate in me to wound them, by requesting they would change their phrases, I deemed it more than matter of curiosity to discover, why this language was used, and why the Catholic was undervalued.[17]

The peak of Dr. England's controversial writings was reached in these *Letters on Blanco White*. "The finest specimen of Bishop England's presentation of Catholic doctrine", we read in the preface to the Messmer edition, "comes to us through the medium of the letter. The Bishop stands a peerless master in the field of doctrinal letter-writing. A single inquiry often calls forth from his pen expositions of doctrine unique in their thoroughness, accuracy, and vigor."

His exposé of Blanco White's religious and moral life up to the *Evidences of Catholicism*, was merciless. Equally so was his

[17] *Works* (Messmer), vol. II, p. 216.

attack upon Bishop Kemp under whose auspices the work was published as a deliberate attempt to prejudice non-Catholics in the United States against the equality of civil and political rights of Catholics. Dr. England asks:

> Has anybody of the Catholic Clergy of the United States ever been guilty of solemnly recommending to their flocks the libels of any Protestant clergyman, who joined the church, as the best mode of learning the tenets and character of the Protestant people? Has anyone of the respectable clergymen, who have joined our Church, made an atrocious attack upon those whose communion he had left? Yet we have many such amongst us. This at least is a sort of bigotry which does not belong to our Christianity. No one of our Bishops has made himself as conspicuous as Bishop Kemp. When we assail their system, it is not by such a work as no modest woman should read, such a work as no man of fine feelings or gentlemanly principle could recommend, if he had read it, as I hope and trust the Right Reverend and Reverend approbators did not.[18]

Blanco White's *Evidences* were built up to a large extent from Paley; and this fact gave Dr. England a splendid opportunity in his *Letters* to sift the whole of the Protestant apologetic of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The discussion ranges from one end of theology to the other, but the essential point at issue between Blanco White and the Church he had abandoned was the problem of spiritual allegiance to the Holy See.

This was the problem which Charles Butler answered in his *Book of the Roman Catholic Church*, and it was the widespread ignorance of the distinction between temporal and spiritual allegiance which made Blanco White's *Evidences* so welcome to Bishop Kemp and to the Presbyterian, Methodist, and Episcopalian ministers who had publicly recommended the book. Blanco White's volume has its place in the opposition which was then reaching its most intense stage against Catholic Emancipation. White's argument was that, if Catholics were ever readmitted to Parliament, they would be obliged by the very nature of their allegiance to Rome to destroy Protestantism in the British Isles. The inference was that, if Catholics were to be vested with any sort of political power, they would be obliged to obey the Pope, should they be commanded to

---

[18] *Ibid.*, p. 271.

stop the progress of Protestantism. White's book was calculated, therefore, to create distrust in Catholic candidates for public office in the United States; and Dr. England accused Bishop Kemp and his associates of having that object in view in stimulating the sale of the book.

The whole series of letters turns about this question, the alleged intolerance of the Roman Catholic Church. Partial citations from these letters would give an inadequate idea of the cogency of Dr. England's reasoning or of the profound knowledge of historical theology he displays in his answers. What he pleads for most is a fair hearing: "I wish to meet the opponents of my Church openly and plainly upon fair ground, before the American public. Before that tribunal I love to plead: for although the current of public feeling is strongly running against my side of the question, I know that if I can once get the mind of America to examine the case fully and fairly, I shall have ample justice."[19]

When it came to intolerance, Dr. England had sufficient material to turn the argument quite conclusively against the Protestant Churches, and this he did from their own theological literature published in the United States. The repertory of the covenants of the Presbyterian Church was a bold but successful method of replying to the charge of intolerance, for they made rather unpleasant reading for Americans of that day. It would indeed be difficult to find any declaration of Faith so freighted with hatred as that contained in the national covenant of Scotland, which the American Presbyterians published as their belief in 1821.

From intolerance, Blanco White proceeded to the century-old charge that Catholics held a doctrine which justified them in not keeping faith with heretics. As a specimen of Dr. England's method of dealing with his opponents, the following paragraph is given:

> Do they charge upon their fellow-citizens the horrid crime here imputed to the great bulk of Christendom, of which the Roman Catholics of this Union form a portion? Is it possible that they impute to the venerable survivor of that patriot band, which gave liberty and power to our glorious republic, that there is a true foundation for the charge, that he would not keep faith with heretics? Was there a foundation of truth for the charge, that Lafayette, Rochambeau, Pulaski, De Grasse, and

[19] *Ibid.*, p. 365.

so many other Roman Catholics did not keep faith with heretics? Was Arnold a Roman Catholic? Did the Pennsylvania line, which was eminently Catholic, keep faith with heretics? Did Louis XVI keep faith with heretics? My friends, there is a point at which the mind almost loses its power of argument, and indignation becomes a virtue. Who would stoop to argument with a seducer? Who would dispute upon the impropriety of defamation? Who would endeavor to convince a calumniator? There was a time when the gross multitude of ignorant Englishmen was duped by the knavery of an unprincipled court, which deluded one portion of its subjects, that it might be enabled to grind down other nations, and thus play the tyrant over a divided and debased population; but when that court made its essay at this side of the Atlantic, young America rose in the vigor of her intellect, the power of her strength, and the pride of her independence; and, with the aid of a Catholic nation, broke a tyrant's sceptre, and placed her foot upon his crown; whilst the delighted eagle of her Appalachian hills played around her head, leaving in his track the halo of her glory and of his joy; and shall the American mind at this day be enthralled by the calumnious influence of the British court? Shall our country, whilst she ranks high amidst the nations of the earth, still be debased by her children, in being made the receptacle of the vilest libels of the most persecuting court in Christendom? Is this the liberality of our clergy? Is this the learning of our ministers of religion? Is this the independence of our spirit? Is this the affection of our fellow-citizens? Is this the honor of America, that, when even Hodge declares that the Pope of Rome has neither tail nor horns; when, from John O'Groat's house to the cliffs of Dover, it is avowed that he is not a scarlet lady; when a starving population proclaims that it has been deceived by a bloated clergy, and robbed and degraded by an oppressive government? Is this the honor of America, that at such a time as this, when a Catholic people is told by a profligate prince, who has been publicly convicted before the parliament of his country, of making the highest offices of the nation the price of his paramours' crimes that as God shall help him they shall be kept in bondage, the clergy of the Protestant Churches of America should combine to fling upon their Catholic fellow-citizens the dregs of the calumnies which have emanated from such a source, and give to the American people the offal, which the very rabble of Great Britain has rejected? For shame! That our country should have so low a place, as that Bishop Kemp and his associates should have no other mode of assailing us, save the fragments

of those poisonous arrows, which they collect from the fields in which their discomfited brethren have fallen in Europe![20]

In the midst of the series of *Letters*, Bishop Kemp, to whom Dr. England indirectly aimed all his replies to White's charge, was called to his eternal reward. In his letter (XLV) of November 5, 1827, Bishop England writes:

> Since writing my last letter, I have with feelings of pain and sorrow read the account of Bishop Kemp's unexpected and melancholy death. I deeply regret that my last letter contains a call upon him, and that call written at a time when he had paid the debt of nature, though I did not and could not have known it when I wrote. I regret it, because should any of his friends read that call after the interment of a respected and lamented friend, the feeling which it must create, will be to them unpleasant, and such as I would not desire to produce. I trust they will accept this explanation. With the deceased prelate I had never the honor of an acquaintance, to him I bore no feeling of unkindness, I sympathize with his afflicted relatives; but from his own act he made it necessary for me in the course of my previous letters to address many of my observations to him, as the leader of an host by which my Church was, as I conceive, without foundation or necessity assailed, by the recommendation of White's libelous production, as an accurate portrait of Catholicism, to the perusal of the Protestants of America. I am bound in charity to believe that Bishop Kemp in doing what deeply wounded a large and respectable portion of his fellow-citizens, acted according to his knowledge and conviction, and sense of duty. And when I an humble individual knew that knowledge to be delusion, that conviction to be unfounded, and that sense of duty to be erroneous; I did appeal to him for the correction of my statements, if in his power, the subversion of my principles, if they were not tenable, and the disproving of my conclusions, if they could be destroyed. I did so with freedom, and I hope without disrespect; I did so plainly, because the position which he had volunteered to occupy was that of a direct and open assailant of the line in which I am marshalled, and upon a post which I feel bound to defend. But although in the haste of furnishing these generally unrevised and uncorrected letters for publication, many expressions have escaped me, which I would upon a review suppress, and some of those be more harsh than I should desire to use, still I trust that at no moment has there been in my heart one move-

[20] *Ibid.*, pp. 374-375.

> ment towards this lamented individual which was inconsistent with kind and charitable feeling. He has passed away; called before a just and merciful God; who I should hope regarded him with that compassion which each of us would desire for himself; of course his name shall no more appear in these letters. Dr. Wilmer too, whose signature first stood at the head of the list is no more; I shall therefore in any appeal which I might feel it proper henceforth to make, address the survivors as a body, rather than select an individual as their representative. I felt it, if not required, to be at least a relief to myself to make this explanation, and shall now resume my task.[21]

The *Letters* came to a close with the fifty-eighth of the series on March 10, 1828. Out of the labor this controversy cost him, Dr. England believed that much good would eventually come. There were thousands who read his letters, and among them many Catholics who had never before had the doctrines of the Faith properly expounded to them. Dr. England did not at this time, or indeed in the whole course of his episcopate, blame the rank and file of Protestants for imputing to Catholics certain doctrines they did not hold, because the opportunities of knowing what the Catholic Church taught were very limited. The very books which non-Catholics wrote and published to explain these doctrines were so filled with gross misrepresentations of the truth that the blame in his eyes was placed always where it belonged: upon their spiritual leaders, who had the learning and the sources to explain Catholic theology rightly and adequately.

---

[21] *Ibid.*, vol. III, pp. 18-19.

CHAPTER XXXII

Writings of Bishop England
II: 1828-1840

The year 1828 was fairly well taken up with Dr. England's important controversy with the Rev. Dr. Bowen, Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church of South Carolina, and one of Bishop England's warm friends in Charleston. On July 14, 1828, Dr. England wrote to Bishop Bowen, under the initials "B. C.", the first of thirteen letters on the subject of a *Protestant Catechism* which was for sale in the city. He opened the discussion as follows:

> I am a Roman Catholic citizen of South Carolina and amongst a number of publications that issue from the Protestant press, which I sometimes read, is the *Gospel Messenger and Southern Episcopal Register, by members of the P. E. Church,* printed in this city. I observed on the last page covering the number for this month, an enumeration of *Tracts kept for sale on account of the Charleston Female Episcopal Bible, Prayer-book, and Tract Society, by Edwin Gibbes, No. 48 Broad Street.* The first book on the list was a *Protestant Catechism, showing the principal errors of the Church of Rome.* I purchased a few copies, one of which now lies before me. I was shocked when I read it. I have read some of the most blasphemous publications of all sorts of unbelievers, but I do not recollect to have ever found more objectionable matter in so small a compass, as in the 16 pages of this *Protestant Catechism.* I next succeeded in procuring *The First Annual Report of the Board of Managers of the Female Episcopal, Bible, Prayer-book, and Tract Society of Charleston, made at the Anniversary, May 27th, 1828, (being Tuesday in Whitsun week,) together with the Constitution and By-laws of the Society, and a list of the Members,—Charleston, printed by E. A. Miller, No. 4, Broad Street, 1828,* as the *Catechism* was sold for account of this Society. I found the list of members to contain the names of several of the most amiable, respectable, and benevolent ladies in our community. I looked at the *Catechism,* and then again at the names. I reflected whether it was possible that these ladies believed the truth of the contents of that book. If they did, how could they associate with Roman Catholics? If they did not, how could they

exert themselves to disseminate what they did not believe to be true, and that of the most defamatory nature, and the most insulting and degrading to the great majority of the Christians now in the universe? I looked again over the pages of the *Catechism*. I found that it entered into topics of such a kind as I imagined those good ladies were not accustomed to discuss; such as the nature of the formula subscribed by Pope Liberius; the disputes between the Arminians and the strict Calvinists, and those stated to have existed between the Jesuits and the Dominicans. I looked at the list of managers, and must avow that I was perfectly astonished at the discovery of their competency to decide upon such topics. But when, on looking over the list of members for life, I discovered your name, together with that of two clergymen, and an honourable lay-gentleman who has swept through the whole literature of ancient and modern times, I was led to believe that the managers sought for more than pecuniary aid from you and your associates. . . .

In the list of tracts circulated I find the twenty-first item to be "71. The *Protestant Catechism*, showing the errors of the Church of Rome (pp. 16)".

As my object is to complain of that publication, Right Reverend Sir, I naturally address myself to you. And I do so in the hope, that you have never read the production of which I complain, but given to it the sanction of your name and office, and approbation, upon the general principle that it was a *Protestant Catechism*, or because of the report of some person upon whose judgment you placed incautious and too easy reliance. I do so in the hope that if I should succeed in showing you that this catechism contains several untruths, and a multitude of libellous charges upon innocent persons, together with the most opprobrious, injurious and uncharitable expressions, illiberal in their own nature, and contumeliously insulting to a large portion of your fellow-citizens, you will have the candour and magnanimity to disapprove of the publication, and thus induce those good ladies to withdraw it from their agent.

My intention, Right Reverend Sir, is not to enter with you upon a polemical disquisition to prove the Roman Catholics in the right and Protestants in the wrong. I go farther, and state, that even if you or any friend of yours should endeavour to give such an issue to my effort, I am at present disposed to leave the field without even placing my lance in rest. I seek not controversy upon the doctrinal differences of the two churches. Neither is it my object or intention to insult or to

vilify the Protestant church, or any of its institutions or members. I have so frequently felt the pain which is inflicted by similar conduct, that I should deeply regret my being its cause to another. My object is, to show that the church of which I am a member has been misrepresented, vilified, and insulted, and to call upon you, not as the person who has done the injury, but as the officer who can afford the redress, to heal those wounds, by arresting, as far as you have power, the progress of the evil.[1]

The little *Protestant Catechism* contained practically every charge ever made against the Roman Catholic Church, its doctrines and its discipline. The questions are cleverly put and are equally cleverly answered. Out of its ninety-four questions and answers, Dr. England selected twenty-eight misrepresentations, one of which he answered in particular, the sale and purchase of indulgences to commit sin. He writes:

Am I in error when I assert my conviction that the respectable Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church of South Carolina does not believe that a Roman Catholic indulgence is a license to commit sin? I think too highly of his intellect, I appreciate the extent of his reading too much, and look upon him to be too prudent and too dispassionate to allow him to fall into the egregious mistake which this little book maintains, under the apparent sanction of that prelate's authority. . . . There can be no security in the city of Charleston for life, liberty, property, or peace, if one-sixth of its inhabitants may be thus licensed to commit every crime for a trifling pecuniary compensation. Your duty would be, if you believed the statement of the book, to denounce those destroyers of society to the legislature, and to cause them to be excluded from our state. . . . Your comparative apathy is then to me evidence of your unbelief of the charge, and leads me to hope that you will vindicate your name and fame from what I must call a libel upon more than two-thirds of Christendom.

It is generally, and I would say correctly, thought that a gentleman of your rank, station, character, and information would upon the discovery of a single falsehood in a book for the instruction of children in the truth of God and the way to Heaven, have the error corrected or withdraw his sanction, and endeavour to repair the injury that had been done. I am led to hope that you think thus also. But if there be a case which above all others calls for such conduct it is the present,

[1] *Works* (Messmer), vol. I, pp. 371-373.

in which a number of the most amiable, virtuous and dignified ladies of one of our most polished states, have through reliance upon your judgment and integrity and honour and delicacy of feeling, given their names to the public as the disseminators of the book which in the places referred to contains, I would say, twenty-eight distinct untruths, which are not only offensive to five-sixths of the Christian world, but injurious to the cause of Christianity. Suppose, Right Reverend Sir, that my enumeration were fastidious or incorrect, you will at least, I trust acknowledge that the little book contains more untruths than one, where I have exhibited twenty-eight. And I shall lay before you several others in my next.

In a second letter, Dr. England answers twenty-five additional misrepresentations and concludes by asserting that he thinks Bishop Bowen to be a man of "too much honour and delicacy and love of truth", to allow the little *Catechism* to remain in circulation.

From these fifty-three misrepresentations, Dr. England proceeded to the inconsistencies in the *Catechism*. The fifteenth question and answer he found particularly detestable: "Q. How do you prove that none of these [Popes] are infallible? A. From many great errors into which several popes and councils have fallen, and from the contradiction of their decrees: one pope condemning what his predecessor had approved, and one council rejecting the decrees of another council." To this Dr. England replied:

Upon the fifteenth question and answer we shall, with God's help, probably have much more to do. At present I can only offer to you, Right Reverend Sir, my immediate abandonment of the Roman Catholic Church; and the Rev. J. F. O'Neil, the Publisher of the *Miscellany*, will give you my name in the circumstance referred to, of which you may then make any use you please, when you shall have proved the truth of that answer as understood in connexion with my preceding remarks, which is explicity this, "that one General Council approved by a Pope rejected or contradicted, or dissented from any decree concerning doctrine of any other General Council approved by the same or by any other Pope". I cannot believe, sir, that you would undertake such a task, and this has led me to hope that you had not approved the publication. I might be mistaken, and I solemnly assure you that the exhibition of one such contradiction as I have above stated will be with me decisive. Let me find but a single flaw in the vase, and I shall acknowledge that

it is not that which Christ has formed. I shall waive every speculative or other argument. I meet you upon a plain matter of fact. Publish the decree, and that decree which contradicts it, and then command me as you please. But, Right Reverend Sir, if you cannot do this, can you, as an honourable man, and a conscientious prelate, approve the publication of what cannot be upheld by evidence?[2]

The *Catechism* was not original with the ladies of Charleston who were promoting it. It was printed originally for the Charter Schools of Ireland, "to inspire", Dr. England says, "the young gentlemen and ladies who were to prop the Protestant ascendency in Ireland, betimes, with a holy hatred of Popery, and to give its full tint to the orange hue, with which it was deemed right to imbue them. To create horror and detestation of their Popish neighbours in the minds of those children of the Church and State, was the great end for which the publication was set forth; and indeed it is well calculated to procure this end. Was such the object of its republication at this side of the Atlantic?"

In closing the series of letters, Dr. England says:

I am overwhelmed with shame; I have avoided as long as I could what yet remains, and what nothing but a strong sense of duty compels me even now to approach. Did you, sir, advise the ladies of Charleston to teach their children in the following words:

82 Q. *What do you think of the obligation which the clergy and all the nuns and friars, and others of the Church of Rome, are under not to marry?*

A. It is so far from being commanded by God, that forbidding to marry (1 Tim. IV. 3) is set down as one of the marks of them who departed from the faith; and is often found to be a dreadful snare to the conscience, and an inlet to the most abominable wickedness.

I have with feelings which I shall not describe read ten times over the names of the ladies on your list of subscribers, and asked whether it was possible they could have published this. They are modest and pure. There are at least ten virtuous women, unmarried and considerably discreet, upon that list. Did they reflect upon the abominable retort, to which they expose themselves? To their honour, to their virtue, to their experience I commit the defence of the useful, virtuous and religious women whom this shameful and wicked paragraph

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 402.

traduces. Other aged ladies may be as pure in body and in mind as an unmarried aged member of the *Female Episcopal, Bible Prayer-book and Tract Society of Charleston* certainly is: in the purity of the Protestant I find the defence of the Catholic. She forgets the protection of her own character when she assails the virtue of the Nun.

But what, sir, shall I say to you? You! a Bishop! Have you ever known a Friar? Have you ever seen a Nun? Do you know a delinquent of either order? Upon what evidence do you condemn? I have known very many of both orders, and though I have known hundreds of the most truly religious men of the one description, the number was very small indeed of whom even suspicion whispered; and of the other sex, amongst hundreds and hundreds, not even the voice of calumny ever, to my knowledge, gave even one name to rumour. It is a delicate subject, not because of the semblance of truth in the foul insinuation, but because of the nature of the subject itself. I repeat, sir, what I have before written.—Your Church teaches a high morality. But would I state that upon the topic of which we now treat, I could, if driven to the necessity of proof, take the British newspapers for the last twenty years, and leave to you all the other special proofs which you could collect from the whole Catholic world, and notwithstanding the vast disparity of numbers between the married and the unmarried clergy, I would abide the issue of bringing case for case. But God forbid, sir, that I should ever find the cause of my religion so bad as to be obliged to grope in the sewers of your Church to drag for the vindication of my own. When I look to your religion, sir, I look to its tenets and not to its offscourings, and neither your Church nor mine teaches immorality, nor does either encourage it; though reprobates are to be found in the society, and perhaps in the ministry of each.[3]

The *Letters to Bishop Bowen* aroused the highly respectable Protestants of the city to the serious charges made against their honor by "B.C.," and the vicious little libel was withdrawn. The whole affair might have been forgotten, in charity, had not a "Protestant Catholic" attacked "B.C.," in the pages of the *Gospel Messenger* of Charleston, as having taxed Bishop Bowen "with wanton and calumnious aggression" of the Catholic Faith. This gave Dr. England an opportunity of coming out with a brilliant defence of the Catholic doctrines impugned in the *Catechism.* In a

[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 485-486.

series of seventeen letters during the following year (1829) he threw down the gauntlet to "Protestant Catholic" and reviewed all the points at issue between the Protestant Churches and Catholicism. Irony and sarcasm run through these pages, and every possible change is rung on the absurdity of one who calls himself by two diametrically opposite names—"the incompatible and ominous name", Dr. England labels it. What is of importance in our estimate of these letters is not the answers given by Bishop England to the charges made rather recklessly against the Church, but the fact that for the first time in the history of Charleston Protestant polemics met a formidable aggressor in the Bishop of Charleston. The general impression at the time was that Catholics had everything to gain and nothing to lose by public controversy of this kind. It must be said to the credit of the intelligent Protestants of the City of Charleston that they were not silent when the question of suppressing the *Catechism* was mooted. The *Letters to Bishop Bowen* put the belligerent group in the non-Catholic circles on their guard, for there was now in their community not only an organ to voice Catholic opinion, but the knowledge at Dr. England's command was so profound and accurate that only the best equipped minds in the non-Catholic camp dared enter the lists.

If any further judgment should be made on Dr. England's methods, it is this: that he made the most of every opportunity non-Catholic opponents gave him. With him, a controversy was never closed. He never provoked a quarrel in the public press; but once begun, he was quite liable to keep at the questions involved, long after the original opponents had dropped out. To explain Catholic doctrine was his duty; to obtain a hearing was almost impossible. But once a controversy aroused his interest, he never lost that interest. Dr. England knew his *milieu* better than any bishop in the American Church. He estimated with far closer accuracy than his colleagues the total dead weight of the centuries of misrepresentation and misunderstanding which was the legacy of American Protestantism. One letter or a series of letters scarcely sufficed to change their prejudices, and in a way that seems today fairly merciless he kept battering at the gates of the intelligence of his non-

Catholic American brethren, seeking to bring to their minds a truer estimate of Catholic doctrine and practice.

There are hard shots all through these *Letters,* as, for example, the following:

> I would just as soon expect a Kalmuc Tartar to comprehend the process of carrying a bill through Congress, or of conducting a suit through our courts, or to comprehend the purport of our festive national celebrations, as to find a well-disposed and well-informed Protestant, who has only the notions which you and yours generally give of our religion, comprehend a single religious celebration of the Catholic Church. I never had to exercise more self-restraint than when listening to the incongruous remarks of some of my most kind and respectable friends, who imagined they displayed knowledge and liberality.[4]

In another paragraph, Dr. England refers to the charge of Catholic disloyalty:

> The few and insulted Catholics of this city, as far as I can learn, despise your correspondent's professed complaisance to them: they claim no superiority over their fellow-citizens of any other place or denomination, either in virtue or in patriotism; they are content to be upon the level of their fellow-citizens in their civic duties, and of every other Roman Catholic in the world, in doctrine and belief. They pay full spiritual and ecclesiastical obedience to the See of Rome, and with as thorough a love of civil liberty, as any other citizen of these states; they acknowledge in their tenets nothing which endangers either that liberty, or the tranquility of the land. By you and by others, their feelings have been wounded, their doctrines misrepresented, their practices vilified, their ceremonial ridiculed, and themselves held up to contempt. Anti-Christ, idolator, heathen, persecutor, intruding stranger, slave of corruption, unclean thing, and vicious, are phrases with which they have been assailed in a state which boasts of its liberality, and vaunts its superior civilization, purity of taste, and its chivalrous honour. God forbid that I should deny that South Carolina is entitled to those characteristics! But the more elevated her dignity, the more humiliating is the reproach of and amongst her children to us! Are we suspected of disaffection to the civil institutions which we labour to uphold? Did we conspire against their domestic peace, and following our own notions of Scripture liberty, whisper

[4] *Ibid.*, vol. II, pp. 136-137.

aught that might overwhelm us in unforeseen ruin? Was our blood or our treasure withheld in any day of peril? Is the charter of your liberties perfect without our name? Did we preach against the acts of your Congress, in the midst of a conflict with the enemies of the land? Did we ever express a reluctance to act against a Catholic, as soon as we would against a Protestant foe? What, then, in the name of Heaven, is the cause of the continual allusion to the dangers of the Republic, from our body? We have never entered into combinations to paralyze the force of the nation, when the enemy was ravaging our shores and burning our capitol. Let your correspondent refer to the history of our common country, which perhaps he understands, in place of dragging us to feudal times, in Europe, of which he knows so little. I cannot and will not stoop to notice the miserable and dishonourable distinction which he touches, in his second note upon this sixty-second paragraph, where he tells us that he does not charge the Pope with being dishonest in retail, but in wholesale; it is not in small transaction that Catholics are rogues, but in mighty concerns. I fling back his insult with the feelings which it so richly merits. I defy him to the proof. He treat of honesty! He treat of good faith! Let him look to his garbling.[5]

The *Pastoral Letter of the Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States*, dated August 20, 1829, issued at the General Convention of that Church in Philadelphia, added fuel to the rising flame, by its insidious appeal to force as a preventative against popery. In January, 1830, the *Protestant* sent out a prospectus of its purposes, chief of which was to rally the Protestant Churches to the "fearful increase of Popery in the United States." The prospectus stated:

> It is no chimerical terror to dread the increase of Popery. The practicability of inoculating our Protestant land with the Papal virus has been tried and has succeeded. Romanism has of late made rapid strides in this country.
>
> To those who know the character of the Jesuits, their organized system, their deep subtilty, and restless exertions in the cause of Popery, it will be sufficient to advert to the appalling fact that men of that insidious order are rapidly pouring into our dominions!
>
> If there were a staunch united phalanx of Protestants, in opposition to papal encroachments, and a corresponding energy

[5] *Ibid.*, pp. 161-162.

and combination on the part of those who abjure Rome, then might we hope for a successful resistance. But mark the bodeful converse! There is apathy and disunion among Protestants. What a deplorable contrast to the zeal, artifices and union of papists! Many persons are not contented even with neutrality, but by an act of suicidal infatuation, support those who seek our common downfall, and thereby exhibit the preposterous spectacle, of men labouring to undermine and pull down the only bulwark, genuine Protestantism, which interposes between themselves and ruin!

Thus cause exists for intense alarm at the present crisis—for there is danger that the principles of popery will be rapidly diffused, and gain an ascendancy, from the apathy and time-serving spirit of Protestants. Be it remembered, that if we participate in Romish guilt, we shall consequently be involved in the destruction of idolatrous Rome.

At this time (1830) the Catholic body as a religious group was greater in numbers than any single Protestant sect. The prevalent idea was that, if the Protestant bodies could unite and present a compact front to the ever-increasing phalanx of the Catholics, there would be less anxiety over the spread of Catholicism. But, on their own confession, they were as opposed to one another as in general all were opposed to the Catholics. The only motive which could make them unite was fear. Fear was then played upon in all its moods and tenses.

There is no doubt that the *Protestant,* in bringing to the surface the general fact that there was too much listlessness, apathy, and indifference to the encroachments of the Catholic Faith among non-Catholics, added to the virulence of the controversy. The Catholic Church was now spoken of openly as "Antichrist", the "Beast", and the "Mother of Harlots". The *Metropolitan* of Baltimore founded in 1830 for the purpose of keeping the "Catholic Question" on a higher plane was well within its rights when it published the following reply to the *Protestant* in April, 1830 :

The spirit which has actuated you in the institution of your Journal, is the most rancorous and anti-christian that can be conceived. Without a solitary sentiment of that charity which is the characteristic of a follower of Christ; without a particle of that sincerity which is the noblest attribute of a man of honour; without an iota of the decorum, which is the ornament of the human character, you have arisen in fierce and unpro-

voked resentment against us, and with the desperation of an assassin, attempt to plunge your reeking dagger into the heart of Catholicism. What then is there so irremissible in the deeds of our religion, what is there so uncongenial in her nature, as to summon all your terror, and arouse all your implacability? You bewail, sir, in the most lugubrious terms, the "effort" which is made to infuse the principles of Catholicism. I might conjure you to cease your lamentations. They will avail nothing: Americans are not to be always the slaves of prejudice: the empty words, "idolatry", "superstition", "Popery", will not continue to alarm an age of freedom and investigation. Proof is now demanded, angry invective will not supply its place. Prove that our doctrines are "antiscriptural"; that our principles are "flattering delusions": prove that we have no claim to truth; that we are the offspring of human caprice; that we have nothing to do with Christ or his apostles; that we are the followers of anti-Christ; prove all this, sir, and the public will rest satisfied and there will be no danger of a rapid "defection from Protestantism". But if in lieu of argument, you rake up the dust of antiquated calumnies, and cause your columns to groan under the burden of epithet piled upon epithet, and misrepresentation heaped upon misrepresentation, you will exhaust your moral strength and lose your time: while those who read, will grow disgusted with *you,* and with your *religion.*

You call upon Protestants to "throw off the morbid affection if they would not sink under the influence of the papal pestilence". Sir, I had flattered myself that the day had gone by when language like this could be used. Are you aware that you are declaiming in a land of universal toleration? Do you reflect, that you are insulting an immense portion of American Citizens, among whom could be numbered many of the ornaments and lights of our Republic? Sir, are you not afraid lest such profane language should reach the withered ear of the last of the patriots, who has lived to see his religion spread over the Union, of which he is the only surviving founder? Do you not know, Sir, that you are outraging the memory of the best, the wisest, and the most virtuous personages?

There are many lengthy citations, hidden away in rare copies of the contemporary press, which would emphasize the serious situation which existed between the militant members of certain non-Catholic churches and the leaders of the Catholic Faith. Many other incidents might be added to round out the general conditions prevailing in American religious circles. There was, for example,

the effort to defeat Edward Kavanagh for the Senatorship from Maine on account of his Catholic faith and his Irish blood. About this time (January, 1831), Rev. Lyman Beecher was beginning his public lectures and sermons against the Catholic Church, which were to lead to the outrage of August, 1834. A favorite topic at school commencements was "Popery."

The burning of the churches began about this time, and the culmination of the appeal to violence came in the destruction of the Ursuline Convent at Charlestown, Massachusetts. Fortunately, as has been mentioned, the courageous zeal of the Catholic clergy and of the nuns during the epidemic of cholera which swept the Atlantic seaboard in 1832 acted as a sedative for a time to the rising anti-Catholic feeling. The Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Charlestown newspapers were eloquent in their praises of these exponents of Catholic charity.

It was to the advantage of the fighting Calvinists not to allow the truth about Catholic doctrines to be known. As an example of the type of sermons Protestants listened to, the following is significant:

> They are filling the land with the wickedness of Popery—they are active and persevering. Schools and Seminaries of learning, nunneries and monasteries, colleges and temples, devoted to monkish superstition, are covering this Protestant land. My christian hearers you must arouse yourselves to drive these monsters from our country, they have cast their net over it, and though vast multitudes have been gathered therein, still, still there is no hope of its cracking. Oh! if you were as generous in subscribing money as are their deluded followers, a different aspect would soon be seen—but you are not. They have abundance of zeal and money. It was only the other day in the Town I came from they out bid me by several hundred dollars, for a large building, capable of accommodating 60 females. The coffers of Europe pour out their treasures into the lap of this mother of *Harlots!* Oh! my dear fellow christians as you love virtue and hate vice—as you prize morality beyond crime—as you prefer the sacred spring that flows from the bible, and gushes forth in such pure streams from the founts of our holy churches, in preference to the muddy water and defrauding mummeries of a monstrous system of idolatry and superstition,—Come forth now in your strength and put down these erroneous doctrines forever.

Roman Catholics are opposed to freedom, religious and civil! They are hostile to the republic and are enemies of liberty!

Nearly a decade of years had passed since Bishop England entered the lists in the columns of his *Miscellany*. Over and over, we find in his writings at this time expressions which can only mean that he was being continually baffled by the Protestant state of mind on all things Catholic. In practically all his longer works he tries to analyze the intolerant spirit towards the Church, and in his diagnosis lays stress upon the fact that the centuries of penal legislation against Catholics which prevailed in the English colonies had created a public sentiment in religious matters that was actively working against complete religious freedom even after a half-century of American liberty. In describing this prejudice he gives us a rather novel insight into the state of mind of many Americans of his day:

> There are no minds over which this prejudice has a more extensive and a better established dominion than those of generous and amiable females, for the very excellence of their disposition leads them to cherish warmly those family attachments from which it springs. This will, I believe, tend greatly to explain what I have frequently observed to be an undoubted fact, and still scarcely to be otherwise explained: that the prejudices against us were strongest in the minds of those ladies who, either sprung from or were connected with the old families who under the British rule, held stations or offices which made them, in some way or other, parties to the approval or execution of the penal laws. That such is the fact in the old country and in this, will scarcely be questioned by those who have had an opportunity of making the observation. Yet those ladies have the very best dispositions and the kindest hearts; they are humane, generous, and affectionate; but their family affections necessarily hold the first place, and they cannot believe that their fathers, and their uncles, and their progenitors, in whom they have found so many good qualities, could be persecutors of innocent people; there must, they think, have been something bad, and of sufficient criminality in the Catholics of that day to have provoked this oppression. Let the practical error be only once in existence. Let men of a certain standing in society be in the habit of oppression, and it becomes a necessary consequence, that the most amiable portion of society becomes unconsciously the preserver of prejudice, and indirectly the advocate of oppres-

sion. This has enabled me often to excuse what I lamented, and solve what would be otherwise insoluble.

Among other causes from which anti-Catholic prejudice sprang, Dr. England mentions: (1) "religious feeling", created by the Protestant pulpit which too often measured its zeal by the number and the intensity of its attacks upon Rome; (2) "the poisoning of the wells of history"; (3) "the misuse of the sciences", especially logic, metaphysics, medicine, chemistry, and law; and (4) "the misuse of belles-lettres". In treating the distortions of history, Dr. England says:

> I here make the assertion, which if I shall not succeed in proving to its full extent, I consent that all which I shall address to you in vindication of our character to our fellow citizens shall be valueless. No nation ever was so guilty of systematic destruction of the truth of history for any purpose, as was the English nation in order to create prejudice against the Catholics. I would be content to put myself upon a trial for life and death, upon the issue of the truth or falsehood of the following propositions, after I should have had the opportunity of proving their truth before an impartial, honest American jury. The British Protestant nation has been almost continually employed in destroying the truth of history for the purpose of bringing obloquy upon the Catholics!! The Government aided in this work, and the Catholic was not allowed to answer, nor allowed the means of refutation. Thus a new source of prejudice was added! From the most voluminous histories to the mere chronological tables; from the College to the Nursery, the labor was to create and to perpetuate prejudice: and this has been continued during centuries. The principle having been adopted soon after the discovery of the art of printing, those distortions of facts have the appearance of being the original and authentic statement of what occurred, and the press having been in the hands of only the opponents of Catholics, no counter statement could be sent forth.

In many of his analyses of the current prejudice he reiterated what he calls the physical impossibility for any American Protestant to be free from prejudice against Catholics. Protestants, he finds, after fifty years of American liberty, were even then still liable to nearly the same extent to religious prejudice, but with the diminution that is caused by the greater caution of making an attack where a reply and a retort might be expected, and in some

places, but not very many, where the opportunity which was afforded for correcting mistakes:

> They have still the same distorted histories, to correct whose statements so little has been done; and that little so lately as to have yet scarcely excited curiosity; much less, research; much less, change of opinion. Scarcely a change has taken place in the mode of abusing science or literature for the purpose of injuring us. I have once, not very long since, felt a kind of melancholy amusement in which however my reveries were occasionally disturbed by a flow of involuntary indignation, at contemplating one of the first graduates at the annual commencement of the College of this State, pouring out as copious a collection of black vomit against our creed as if he was upon the point of expiring of a religious yellow fever. The poor creature could not be so much blamed, for he had probably been infected in the library, if not tainted from his childhood; but I can vouch that no professor of that institution was guilty of creating his disease, nor had the simpleton himself the slightest opportunity of becoming acquainted with several topics upon which he raved; but the books too often contain what the teacher would not have written. How many volumes of religious tracts; how many Gospel and Evangelical and Christian periodical publications, teem with misrepresentation and abuse of our creed! Nay, look at the common newspapers of the day, whose editors boast of their liberality, and confirm their claim to the title by most copious and liberal quotations from every British hireling or malevolent infidel; in the midst of all this, how is it possible for us to expect that we should be held in just estimation by our fellow-citizens? It is then a duty which we owe to them and to ourselves, to attempt our vindication. As we cannot assemble as a body to do this; as our Bishops do not find it convenient or expedient to act as the Irish Bishops and English Vicars have done under similar circumstances, an individual has taken the liberty of addressing to you his sentiments upon the subject. I shall therefore examine the charges made upon us, and give the best answers that I can, in hope that some of our Protestant fellow-citizens may examine the accusation and the defence, and that I may thus happily, at least lessen the amount of that prejudice which I cannot hope to destroy.[6]

Bishop England's theory was that prejudice against the Church would be lessened if Protestants were to abstain from using terms of reproach and insidious epithets. The very name, he states,

[6] *Ibid.*, vol. II, p. 220.

though erroneous, by which we first designate a real or supposed enemy, so strongly prepossesses the mind that no subsequent facts can erase the impression as long as the first error is persisted in; and as an example of the lack of appreciation of such terms, he cites the hated word *Papist* as the chief offender in a hostile phraseology which many use without realizing its offensiveness. His strongest hope for the lessening of prejudice was in the sober-minded citizens of non-Catholic faiths who realized the inherent danger there was to all religious freedom in the continuance of the attacks upon the Catholic Church. This hope he based upon the fact that, while Catholic leaders in the country were strangely silent in the midst of all the abuse of these years, proposals were being made by Protestants to found a "Society for the Protection of Religious Liberty", into which all might come who were desirous of preserving toleration in religious matters and especially all those Protestants who feared the possibility of a Calvinist success in creating a union between the Church and the Government.

Not that the Catholic ranks were entirely inarticulate; for year by year during this decade (1822-1833) Catholic newspapers were printed in most of the large cities of the Union. These weekly newspapers became a power for good in shaping public opinion regarding Catholic doctrine and practice. The founding of these journals lessened the pressure of the attack upon Dr. England, and after 1833 controversy finds a smaller place in the columns of the *Miscellany;* even then it is in the shape of short letters or essays. There are two of these essays which deserve mention in any analysis of Dr. England's writings. The first is a series of papers he wrote under a caption furnished him by the anti-Catholic *Southern Religious Telegraph*, of Richmond, Virginia—"The Republic in Danger", which appeared in the *Miscellany* for 1831. As a Fourth of July editorial for that year, the *Telegraph*, which had gained a dubious fame for vicious attacks upon the Catholic Church, warned its readers of two dangers which "were inextricably bound together", popery and intemperance. The editorial runs as follows:

> Popery has invaded the land and is laying the foundations of an empire, with which, if it prevail, the enlightened freedom of the republic cannot coexist. Let no one be surprised that popery should here be noticed in connexion with intem-

perance: for next to the fire which burns out reason and conscience, that power is to be dreaded which stupifies conscience and blinds the understanding, and withholds the only light which can guide human reason aright, and makes the whole man a superstitious slave to the impositions of a crafty priesthood. Already, "the beast" numbers half a million of subjects in these United States; and the morality and practices of this communion accord so well with the views and feelings of thousands of the descendants of Protestants, who cannot endure the "bigoted rules" of Presbyterians, that the industrious efforts of the minions of the Pope to extend his authority in our land, are regarded with more complacency and delight, than any enterprise in which Christians have engaged to diffuse the light and influences of the Gospel. Yes; it is well known that the anti-Christian moralists of our times have more sympathy for the monster that is forging chains to bind them, than they have for any denomination of enlighted Christians in the land; and here the danger is the more imminent, because it is unseen. The tolerant friends of Popery, who seem to regard it as differing little from the religion of the Bible, or of Protestants, and the indifferent spectators, know not its influence; its power to excite the imagination, captivate the senses, and enslave the mind to forms of superstition, while no truth is brought to bear on the conscience or the heart; nor do they appear to know the fact, which is demonstrated by the whole history of Popery, that civil and religious liberty, as understood in this country the last half century, cannot coexist with the laws of the papal communion. If the latter are administered, liberty must die; from the nature of things, it is impossible for them to flourish together.[7]

It was a new descant upon an old record; but Dr. England realized that this accusation, so foully worded, against the loyalty of American Catholics must be answered. His *Republic in Danger* contains an historical account of the origin of those unpleasant nicknames: Anti-Christ, Papist, Beast, Babylon, Romanist, Romish, Popish, Scarlet Woman, Mother of Harlots, and others, which were in the common parlance of even educated Protestants of those days when speaking of the Catholic Church. Here and there in these essays are passages of incomparable beauty, filled with the pathos of an appeal to non-Catholic Americans not to disfigure the first pages of our national history with fratricidal

[7] *Ibid.*, vol. IV, p. 413.

religious strife. In one place Dr. England recalls the address of the Catholics presented to Washington in 1790 and the reply of the immortal leader. Charles Carroll of Carrollton who signed the address was still living when Dr. England wrote the following lines:

> One of the Catholics who subscribed that address, and who received that answer, yet survives. Isolated in his grandeur, he raises his modest head amidst the graves of all his companions, linking together the past and the present generations; all the affections which we would transmit to the venerable fathers of our republic converge in him, and through him are conducted to them; well has his life been devoted to the practice of virtue, nobly has his fortune been pledged for the benefits of myriads yet unborn; he has seen nearly a century pass away, and his honour is yet untarnished and sacred. And will America permit his departure to be embittered by the proclamation, that because of his profession and practice of the religion of the Alfreds, of the Augustines, of the Dorias, of the Tells, of the Ambroses, of the Fenelons, of the vindicators of Magna Charta, of the heralds of Christianity, of the discoverers of this continent; that because, he is a member of that church which preserved literature and civilized the world, the venerable Charles Carroll shall be classed with the most degraded portion of our sots by unappeasable and domineering bigotry? Yet, is not this the effort which is made?[8]

Bishop England lived at a time when the traditional religious anti-Popery spirit of the new Republic was beginning to transform itself into organized political animosity, and his reflections are especially valuable for a just estimate of the untold hardships the Catholics had to bear during the first half century of the nation's existence:—

> We have had ample evidence of the degradation of the Catholics in the United States at the period of the Revolution. They were sunk below the level of the negroes and of the Indians: few, poor, despised, a by-word, butts of ridicule, objects of suspicion, victims of persecution, the mockery of school-boys, could they be sunk lower on the social scale? They had scarcely the skeleton of a clergy; and the greater portion of that little band consisted of men who had from their childhood been under the rod of affliction and trained up in a contentedness to neglect: they rejoiced that they were

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 440.

thought worthy to suffer reproach for the name of Christ. With scarcely an exception they were men who, though erudite, yet kept aloof from the learned, and occupied in the discharge of their functions amongst their scattered poor, were only occasionally noticed by the public as strange objects of an undefined curiosity or of pity, or contempt, or of execration. The notions which the bulk of the citizens entertained of the doctrines of the Catholic Church were the most preposterous: they were formed from the worst books of their most unprincipled opponents; from the allegations and preambles of the laws of their most bitter persecutors; from the tales of terrified old ladies, and the declamations of religious teachers, in whom, it is hard to determine whether gross ignorance of Catholic tenets, or fanatical hatred of everything Catholic predominated. The pulpit, the press, the bench, the bar, the public prejudice, the assemblies of the people, the representations of the theatre, the hall of the college, the lesson of the school, the tale of the nursery, whatever occupied the meditation of the sage, or guided the progress of the child, was all,—all, eminently and emphatically anti-Catholic. The Pope was the beast of the apocalypse, the church was the harlot who made the nations of the earth drunk with the cup of her abominations, Rome was the great custom-house of sin, at which a stipulated tariff was to be paid, for leave to commit with impunity every crime by which man could be stained or God could be offended; incest, sodomy, murder, parricide, might be perpetrated upon a trifling composition! Every Catholic was the sworn and devoted slave of the cruel tyrant who presided in the pest-house of abomination; an admirable contrivance of wicked moral mechanism enabled the monster to touch the springs by which his orders were secretly and securely and infallibly executed at the same moment, in a thousand places upon the surface of the globe, and by which he has infallibly learned all that occurred. The bishops confessed to him and received his directions; from these, he learned all that others had communicated to them, and through their agency, he conveyed his will to all his other vassals: each prelate stood in a similar relations to the priests, who were the conductors between him and the people: and all were to consider the Pope as the Lord God: his will could change virtue into vice, and make vice become virtue. The inquisitors also were his agents, who, by his command, destroyed in the most cruel manner, all who dared to question his omnipotence.

This tyrant looked upon kings as his slaves, and set his feet upon the necks of emperors; he abominated republicanism, and commanded the Bible to be destroyed. He lifted himself up

in the temple of God against himself, and substituted a gross and desolating superstition for the pure religion of the Apostles, a pageantry of corrupt and tawdry worldly pomp, for the observances of the meek and lowly Jesus. Every crime which was perpetrated under the semblance of religion, every political machination in which a Catholic was concerned, every suffering of a Protestant in a Catholic nation, for what crime soever, all were attributed to the ravening of this monster for human blood; real cruelties were aggravated, and imaginary atrocities were conjured up, and this revolting aggregate of everything vile and villanous was styled the religion of Roman Catholics! How the understanding is shocked, and the heart shudders, and charity recoils from the contemplation! Does not the question naturally present itself? If the American people had such notions of the religion of Roman Catholics, how could they tolerate an individual of that communion in the country? I shall not answer that question; but I bring two facts under your observation. 1. They did tolerate Catholics amongst them, and the general impression in their regard was such as I have imperfectly sketched. I will go farther, and say such is the picture which the Evangelicals would give of us today; such is the notion honestly formed by a vast portion of our fellow-citizens at present; and 2. Not one single trait of the above picture is correctly drawn; no one of the features of the Catholic religion is there fairly or honestly represented. That which is now, unfortunately, the mistake of perhaps half our fellow-citizens, was, fifty years ago, the delusion of nearly the whole body.[9]

In this same essay Dr. England prophesied that, unless the religious rancor abated in the nation, violence would undoubtedly be the outcome. That prophecy was to come true within a decade. He warned the Catholic public of the United States that ill-will and malignity were rising against them because of their increase in numbers and of their alleged political influence. He showed beyond all caviling that there was in Protestant ministerial circles "the settled design of degrading and disfranchising" the Catholics of the nation:

I have shown you that the Christian party in politics not only has not ceased to exist but is strong, active, compact, powerful, extensive, industrious, prudent, wealthy, and ambitious. The means which it has selected, have been judiciously chosen, and are likely to insure its predominance. It calls upon the

[9] *Ibid.*, pp. 446-447.

people not only to tax themselves for its support, but also to pray for its success; and like its precursor in England, it is careful whilst they pray, to take such steps as will conduce to the efficacy of the appeal. Whilst Aaron and Hur sustain the hands of Moses upon the mountain, the sword of Josue smites powerfully upon the plain. It is for you to say whether our civil and religious rights are to share the fate of Amelec.[10]

In 1833 occurred the controversy between Rev. Dr. Brownlee and Fathers Powers and Levine. Protestants generally surmised that their faith might have had a worthier defendant. The Hughes-Breckinridge controversy came to an end on August 15, 1833, and again the general feeling was that from the Protestant standpoint the controversy was a mistake.[11]

In the year 1835, North Carolina and New Jersey could be spoken of, as they were generally, as "Protestant" States. In the history of religious liberty the action of North Carolina this year in amending its constitution, by striking out the word "Protestant" and inserting the word "Christian" is an outstanding fact. The change came about through the appointment of William Gaston to the Supreme Court of North Carolina. It was the opinion of all the leaders in North Carolina that Judge Gaston was not disqualified from accepting office under the Protestant clause (xxxii) of the Constitution: "That no person who shall deny . . . . the truth of the Protestant Religion . . . . shall be capable of holding office or place of trust or profit in the Civil department within this State." No sooner had Judge Gaston taken his seat on the supreme bench than he was attacked (July, 1835) by Baltimore's leading Presbyterian anti-Catholic, the Rev. Dr. Robert J. Breckinridge, in the Baltimore *Literary and Religious Magazine.*

Now, Mr. Gaston, is at this moment, a Judge of the Court of Appeals of North Carolina. Before he took his seat on the bench, he took an oath, in some usual form, to support the constitution of that state. Part of that constitution, asserts and assumes, the truth of the Protestant religion. But, Mr. Gaston

[10] *Ibid.*, p. 508.

[11] In 1834 appeared an anonymous publication in Philadelphia, containing a long list of detestable doctrines charged to Catholics, to which the Rev. Dr. Miller, Professor of Church History, at Princeton College, prepared an introductory letter. This tirade ends with the charge that Catholics are the "Enemies of God and Man", and are so deplorably abandoned that they needed "to be watched as so many highwaymen or assasssins."

> is an avowed, and most decided Papist!—Now, will he do himself the justice, mankind the favour and his religion the service, of explaining this conduct? Here he is, living in the practical duty, voluntarily undertakes an oath, to maintain that which involves the truth of the Protestant religion; while he daily professes to hold and believe every word and title that is protested against—as also true and binding . . . . . We omit any extended notice of that part of the article quoted above, which disqualifies all persons, "*who shall hold religious principles incompatible with the freedom and safety of the state*". The public are fully aware, that for two hundred years, all real Protestants, have believed and taught, that the essential doctrines of the Papal church were incompatible with civil and religious liberty. The altar and the throne have been welded together for a thousand years; and the oppression of the bodies and the death of the souls of men have been compassed by the united hands of kings and priests. This discussion is now rife in our own land; and we simply invite our readers, to make themselves acquainted with its progress. It cannot be denied, that this clause in the constitution of North Carolina, was meant and supposed to exclude, the peculiar principles of the Roman faith; though the nature of the subject, renders it less proper for this occasion, than the clearer preceding enactment in the same article.

On July 1, 1835, the Convention, called at Raleigh for the purpose of changing this clause of its Constitution, passed by a vote of 74 to 33 the amendment which abrogated the last restraint upon the religious freedom of the Catholics in North Carolina.[12]

In September, 1835, Judge Gaston was invited to address the American Literary and Philosophic Societies of Princeton College. He did not hesitate to denounce the religious bigotry which at that time was centered around himself:—

> Those evils are to be cured—by whose interference? By that of the people? But who are here intended by the people? The most passionate, fierce, vindictive, rash and uninformed por-

[12]Cf. *Records* (ACHS), vol. VI, pp. 255-261. In the *Historical Records and Studies* (USCH), July, 1926, Edward F. McSweeney has published Gaston's *Speech on Religious Toleration* with a biography of the man whom Webster declared to be the greatest man in the War Congress of 1812-1815. Chief Justice Taylor of the Supreme Court of North Carolina was Gaston's brother-in-law. William Draper Lewis (*Great American Lawyers*) has placed North Carolina's foremost Catholic side by side with Marshall, Choate, Webster, Storey, Mason, and Baldwin. Chief Justice Marshall was heard to say on several occasions that he would cheerfully resign his post if he could secure Judge Gaston in his stead.

tion of the people, acting upon the impulse of sudden excitement, banded under furious leaders, sometimes unknown, often irresponsible, and generally actuated by a spirit of personal malice, swollen into formidable strength by the accession of all who love mischief and riot in crime, and hurried into deeds of atrocity, which not one in ten contemplated or intended when he first engaged in the scheme of violence. We have seen it in innocent females driven forth from their dwellings by ferocious incendiaries. Choose then whom you will serve, yourselves or a mob; a government of law or a government of force.[13]

The *Awful Disclosures* of Maria Monk, which appeared about this time gave to many the chance they were seeking, to vilify the priests and nuns throughout the country, and a veritable deluge of obscene suggestions and downright slanders came from the Protestant press. On all sides sober-minded editors pleaded with the ministers who edited and directed these anti-Catholic publications to put an end to the unholy warfare. But with the Massachusetts Legislature standing firm against just compensation for the destruction of the Charlestown Convent, the Protestant diatribists did not need to fear a reaction to their fearful flood of abuse. It was in vain that such appeals as the following from the Columbia, South Carolina, *Telescope* (March 5, 1836) were made:

For this reason, we have once before in the simple discharge of our duty as conservators of Public Right, felt ourselves bound to raise our voices against the systematic efforts which have been lately making, to get up a popular alarm and crusade against the Catholics. That sect, let its character of organization be what it may in European countries, is here, as to public liberty and intelligence, *right*, the moment it is assailed by methods, the employment of which against others was, in its time of domination, its great reproach. If it is alleged yet to resort to such in countries where it has an unbridled ascendency, why, the whole matter is, that it does precisely what in point of historical fact, all sects do as soon as they become strong enough. And for what is it, that we are to be induced to condemn the Catholics as persecutors—enemies of both civil and religious freedom? Truly, for no other purpose than this—*that the hostile sects denouncing them may imitate precisely what they accuse!*

We need scarcely remind the public of the atrocious out-

[13] *Cath. Misc.*, vol. XV, p. 291.

rage committed, last year, in Boston, against an amiable, pious, and most charitable society of females; whose property, of about $80,000—the accumulated fruits of many years of harmless ingenuity and labour—was all destroyed in a single night —their very persons scarcely escaping. This revolting fact—the shame of Massachusetts, and a lasting stigma upon her laws—has been followed by no public redress nor compensation; and the helpless and ruined victims of bigot fury and credulity have been compelled to seek shelter in regions more liberal and humane.

Such could be the fruits, in this free country, of a religious libel. Without trial, without examination, without proof, upon the mere accusation of a single informant, of character entirely questionable, a community of defenceless women, gentle, unoffending, pious, benevolent, industrious and useful is beset by a furious mob; chased from the retreat, in which charity and their own labour had sought to place them apart from the ruder scenes of life; and made in a single night, beggars and vagrants.

But this terrible spirit of mutual persecution stops not at a single exploit of havoc. Inhumanity is not yet exhausted; a single convent only has yet been destroyed. If, in Massachusetts Catholics have none of the privileges of citizens nor Christians, nor even sex, there are yet other States where a beastly rabble cannot, with impunity, plunder and sack their religious retreats. Up, then, O bigotry! It is time to be a-doing. Pour fresh inventions into the ready ear of fanatic credulity. Whisper of chains and racks and dungeons under ground. Conjure up mysteries and horrors, such as the prolific brain of Mrs. Radcliffe could alone create; and heap them all upon the poor heads of a few unhappy nuns and friars, whose poverty and self-sacrifice and celibacy are the very last things to find imitators, in America. Alarm the country for its liberties. Carry us back, not only across the ocean, but into a past century; and, in an age and among a people like ours, run us mad, with the apprehension of *a popish plot!*[14]

An endeavor to meet the flood of abuse with a Catholic Periodical Library was made. "Popery" throughout the length and breadth of the land had become the watchword for intolerant attack. Though divided on every subject in any way connected with Protestantism, nay, at war even on what was fundamental to that religion, there was one point on which all Protestants could and did

[14] *Ibid.*, p. 331.

unite, the abuse of Catholics, their creed, and their religious practices. The "fathers of orthodoxy", as Dr. England called them, contemplated not only the disenfranchisement of Catholics, but also the protection of the law for their plan of exclusion. The language employed by all who participated in the politico-religious controversies of the period reached at times a bitterness that is unbelievable. As Bishop England saw the situation by the middle of the year 1836, there was no hope of continuing any longer the discussion of the mooted points, in what had become a great national religious debate, along the stately lines of the older contestants. His writings for the first sixteen years of his episcopate (1820-1836) constituted the ablest apologetic ever penned by an American prelate on the "Catholic Question". A period of quiet was to set in about 1837, owing to other problems affecting national life; but the succeeding years (1840-1850) were to witness a significant change in the method of attack from the Protestant camp. Diatribe had failed and the incentive to violence logically followed.

The first note of the new method, however, was sounded as early as June, 1836, by the Presbyterian Convention of Pittsburgh when it issued "a new and furious attack on our Roman Catholic citizens"—to use a phrase from the non-Catholic *Manufacturer* of that city; and it would appear, as the editor of that paper writes, that "the Assembly intends to revive with tenfold violence the persecution of Catholicity".

In opening the sixteenth volume of the *Catholic Miscellany* (July 9, 1836), Dr. England thus pictures the situation: ,

> There is one fact too notorious to be screened—that against such of the citizens of these states, as profess the doctrines of our Church, there exists a feeling of, and in some cases a deadly, hostility. The assertion we know is a strong one—but common candour calls for it. No matter what may be the differences—and sometimes they are bitter enough,—that distract occasionally our separated brethren, whether they regard the canonicity of a particle of scripture, or the translation of a word—of the disbursement of the contents of the Missionary Corbons, or the thunders of an excommunication—or any thing else whether for the heathen at home or abroad, still in denouncing Catholicity throughout the length and

breadth of the land, there is found a common ground upon which the discordant camps can meet and bend in amity. We have abundant evidence to support the remark: and should any individual betray the least symptom of incredulity, as to the truth of the fact, that Catholicity is all save formally proscribed in the great republic of modern days, let him only fix his eye on the blackened battlements of Mount Benedict, or peruse the envenomed effusions of the American Protestant press. Nor can the charge be honestly confined, as the phrase would suggest, to what is called the *religious* press of the Country; for we think we could make out the case, that the political press is to a considerable extent tinged with that tone of bigotry, which unfortunately but too signally marks the former. With politics we of course have nothing to do; who may be the successful candidate for any office in the gift of the people, as little; though as citizens of the United States, we reserve to ourselves the privilege of exercising when we think fit the rights belonging to such. We would only remark then that it is rather ominous to find the spirit of that press which should be the first to arrest the march of intolerance, teeming with the rancour of polemics, descending on the eve of an election—for party purposes—to embitter a spirit which on such occasions is but too highly inflamed, by blending politics with religion.[15]

The Purcell-Campbell Debate of 1837 had the good effect of softening much of the current animosity. In summing up the results of the Debate, the Cincinnati *Daily Gazette* said:

A new feeling favorable to Catholicism has been created in the minds of many, by the discussion. It may be thus explained.

For some two or three years incessant efforts have been made to cast odium upon the Catholics, especially upon their clergy. This has been particularly the case in Boston, in New York, and Cincinnati. An inundation of books, various and successive, have been poured upon the country, calculated to make an impression that the Catholic Convents were receptacles of the most flagitious enormities. The bald grossness of these fabrications, upon any other subject, would have been generally denounced as too indecent for countenance in an intelligent community. Even an allusion to their contents, in a newspaper, is a trenching upon propriety. We had "Secrets of Female Convents Disclosed." We had Rebecca Reed's narration of the Ursuline Convent, burnt down by Protestant

[15] *Ibid.*, p. 350.

mobbish violence. We had Maria Monk's monstrosities at Montreal. All these abominations have been greedily received by many, in this community—have been read and credited, so as to impress the reader with the belief that Catholicity was the monster they represented it to be. Refutation was out of the question; it would not be listened to if offered. Nay, to question the narrations was held to associate the questioner with Catholics, and brand him as a participator in their crimes. The Protestant pulpits, in Cincinnati, or most of them, presented Catholicism in unfavourable lights. Family conversations were of the same tendency. There was, in fact, an incessant and strong current running in one direction unfavorable to Catholicism. In this state of things, Protestantism, apparently, had nothing to apprehend, in Cincinnati. She had no occasion for a champion. But a tilting gladiator, on the field of religious debate, came among us, and an occasion was contrived, by an inconsiderate few, to invite him to an exposition of Catholicism. Hence this debate. Through it, the Catholics have been heard, by hundreds, if not thousands, of Protestants, who came to witness the prostration of the whole fabric and all its institutions and adherents, and who came to believe the worst that could be said of them. Many of these received new impressions. They heard the Bishop's exposition of the points of exception, and they learned that they had believed much that was disputed, and had condemned much, that was capable of plausible explanation. They ascertained that Mr. Campbell was often at fault, in his assertions and in his arguments. They saw him sometimes nonplussed, and often hard pressed. Thus did they come to understand that there was a fair side as well as a foul one for Catholicism, and herein have the Catholics gained in something, whilst they have suffered in nothing.[16]

In his first editorial in the eighteenth volume of the *Catholic Miscellany*, Dr. England said to his patrons (July 7, 1838):

When we review our own special position as a religious body, the Catholics of these United States have reason for much congratulation. With only one miserable and insignificant exception [New Jersey], we are upon a perfect legal and constitutional equality with our fellow-citizens of other religious denominations. Would to God, we could say that they regard us with kindness, and speak of us with justice! . . . Yet though we be objects of hate to the bigot and of calumny

[16] *Ibid.*, vol. XVI, p. 6. The year 1837 saw the formal organization of the Native-American Party and its entrance into politics. Cf. McMaster, *Hist. of the People of the United States*, vol. VI, p. 362.

to the evil speaker, we may fairly say, that we possess the confidence and sympathy of the majority of our fellow-citizens, and that the evil devices of our enemies have recoiled upon themselves. They found that the misrepresentation of our tenets, the libelling of our clergy, the destruction of our convents, the plundering of our poor labouring and industrious population, the insulting and the disbanding of our volunteer companies, the procuration of parsons and of harlots to forge licentious fables,—were not sufficient to draw down upon us the ruin which they desired! They have now recourse to an expedient, at least as old as the Christian religion, and of which the accusers of the Saviour gave example to the persecutors of the early Christians.—When nothing could succeed in uprooting their religion,—they were marked for destruction by branding them as enemies to the government. So it is with us. But we challenge investigation. Let our accusers descend to particulars. We can point to those who were known to be traitors—they were not of our creed, nor were they what is improperly given as an appellation to adopted citizens. They were not *foreigners*. When we are assailed by our calumniators, we may answer, as the suffering soldiers of the Pennsylvania line did to the British agents, who in the moment of their mutiny by reason of distress, and of unredressed wrongs, ventured to offer them pardon, promotion and plenty, if they would go over to the enemy: *We are not Arnolds!*

No! Our calumniators will not undertake to do an impossibility. They will not promise to specify the faithlessness of Americans, whether native or adopted, to American institutions, but they will make vague charges, and dark insinuations, and write big words and refer to Europe. This device will fail! Though we are as a Body, the least wealthy of the religious societies in the Union, we still have the greatest fund of true riches in the indomitable and labourious industry of our members. We have greatly increased, we are increasing, and we will increase, in numbers and in property,—and we trust in piety and zeal.

Fifty years ago we had no Bishop—today we have sixteen Sees in the United States, and count an Archbishop and sixteen bishops. We have colleges, schools, convents, provinces of religious orders, and a well educated, zealous, and faithful priesthood. If the Catholic Church in the United States wants much for its perfection, she has done much and acquired much and her march is onwards. When we hail our national festival and rejoice at the prosperity of our country, we should also remember, that amidst greater obstacles and with less human means, our national church has also made a corres-

> ponding advance and with God's blessing, the standard of the cross will float in safety under that clustering constellation which we hope will, ere the lapse of the century, shed its peaceful influence upon a confederation of republics diffusing to distant shores in its own ships, the fruits of its industry, and receiving from other nations the tribute of their wealth in its ports on the Atlantic and the Pacific. We pray that, as our country adds to the years of her history, she may add also to the light of knowledge, the riches of piety, the charity of religion, the affection of her citizens, their honour before men and their favour before Heaven.[17]

Bishop England's last series of papers, on *Domestic Slavery,* is connected with the Presidential election of 1840, one of the most freakish the country had beheld up to that time. The overwhelming victory of the Whigs indicated a revolution in politics and marked an important stage in the history of slavery in the United States.[18] Bishop England was drawn into the campaign by the editor of the Baltimore *Pilot and Transcript,* General Duff Green, who was favorable to Harrison. Green's purpose was to identify Dr. England and the Catholics generally with Van Buren, who had given offense to the "Saints", in 1830, when as Secretary of State, he had written a courteous letter to the Pope. The religious issue was present but not predominant in the campaign of 1840, but the slavery issue was. Forsyth, Van Buren's Secretary of State, in an address in Georgia, in August, 1840, declared that Harrison, who may in some respects be considered the first Anti-Slavery candidate for the Presidency, "was forced upon the Southern portion of the opposition by a combination of anti-Masonry and Abolitionism." With this combination Forsyth associated the Catholic Church and offered as proof Gregory XVI's Apostolic Brief on the Slave Trade. Forsyth attributed the Pontifical Brief to O'Connell's influence, since at that time the Liberator and others were agitating for the abolition of slavery in the British Dominions. To arraign the Pope as an Abolitionist would further antagonize the Southerners against the Catholics. Bishop England came forward in defense of the Holy See, and maintained that not only was the Apostolic Brief not inspired

[17]The student interested in the Anti-Catholicism of these years will find in the *Cath. Misc.* (Vols. XVIII, XIX, and XX) many curious letters revealing the practices of the American Protestant missionaries in the Sandwich Islands.

[18]Cf. Robinson, *Evolution of American Political Parties,* p. 118.

from British sources, but that far from condemning domestic slavery the Holy Father endorsed it. In his letter of October 4, 1840, he quoted the Holy Father as having said to him in an interview: "Though the Southern States of your Union have had domestic slavery as an heirloom whether they would or not, they have not engaged in the negro traffic, that is, the slave trade." Bishop England then proceeds to say: "I trust I have succeeded in showing that this letter of his Holiness which you described to be an Apostolic Letter on slavery does in fact regard only that slave trade which the United States condemned and not that domestic slavery which exists in our Southern States."[19] Dr. England did not finish the *Letters on Domestic Slavery*, but in the eighteen which were printed in the *Miscellany* in 1840-1841, he gives the history of ecclesiastical legislation concerning slaves and slavery with an amazing number of citations from the Fathers, Church historians and canonists.

From the standpoint of scholarship, probably his outstanding work is that which was published in 1840 under the title *Letters concerning the Roman Chancery*, the result of his controversy with Rev. Richard Fuller, of Beaufort, South Carolina. The Fuller controversy arose over a resolution passed on July 22, 1839, by the Prince William Temperance Society, petitioning the South Carolina Legislature to enact a law of prohibition in that State. In the resolution the following sentence is found:

> Your petitioners are not without apprehension that their prayer may at first encounter opposition from those who have not seriously reflected on the misery which intemperance is inflicting upon our population, bond and free, the blight it is shedding upon the dignity of our State and the happiness of our homes. But at least the motives of your petitioners will be respected, nor will the virtue and piety of her children let die the principles on which they address you, until the time shall come, when the legislators of a Christian community will regard an enactment to license the retail of ardent spirits, with the same abhorrence which they feel toward the statute formerly passed by the Roman Chancery, making

[19]Bishop England's stand on slavery is ably discussed by Rev. Stephen L. Theobald in the *Records* (ACHS), vol. XXXV (1924), pp. 325-344 [*Catholic Missionary Work among the Colored People of the United States* (1776-1866)].

assassination and murder, and prostitution, and every crime, subjects of license and taxation, and regulating the price at which each might be committed.[20]

When pressed by Dr. England to give proof of the assertion in the Prince William Memorial, Fuller adduced the " 'Tax-Book of the Roman Chancery', printed in Rome in 1514, at Cologne in 1515, at Paris in 1520 and other places." The controversy which followed was the most serious in which Dr. England engaged. Both sides were undoubtedly aided by friends in the collection of sources for the discussion, and there is in reality, a fairly large library of books mentioned in the *Roman Chancery*. The letters from both contestants sparkle with interest, and since they appeared in the Charleston *Courier* they were widely read and commented on at the time. Fuller closed his side of the controversy with the following passage:

I despatch the above, before your promised explanations and confessions have reached me. After the premonitory of the *Courier*, I am unwilling to expose you to temptation, by entering on a subject which, by the bye, you carefully evaded while the press was open, and the public patience not exhausted. Reverend sir, I anticipate fully your course of argument as to absolutions, indulgences, and so forth. But all ingenuity here is expended in vain. The word of God levels against the whole system its distinct and unequivocal denunciation, and it is notorious that the Popes cared no more for your theories than I do, when they wanted money. That there were men who lifted an unavailing cry against the existing abuses, I well know, although poor Jerome and Huss teach us what was their reward. But, if your confessions shall merit the title, if they prove not a mere confirmation of Massillon's remark, that "the confessions of most persons are only a studious arrangement of words, to soften and embellish," and so forth, *l'arrangement etudié des expressions qui adoucissent l'horreur*, and so forth, if, in short, you acknowledge one thousandth part of what all history attests, then, you must admit abominations so ineffably and infinitesimally enormous, that our judges will be amazed at your indignation about the Tax-book; and, while they look in horror at the character of your clients—priests, abbots, bishops, cardinals, popes, councils, and the whole church, they will unanimously turn to me, and exclaim, in the language of an old acquaint-

[20] *Works* (Messmer), vol. IV, p. 30.

ance of yours at school: *Solventur risu tabulae—tu missus abibis.*[21]

Dr. England's final word was as follows:

Illness and its consequent debility prevented me from making an earlier reply to your communication of the 25th of last month.

The Rev. Mr. Fuller, misled by a host of writers who copied one of the earliest falsehoods that was invented to vilify our church, and to justify the secession of those who called themselves "Reformers," I am convinced, was honestly under the impression that the Protestant imitations of the *Tax-book* of the Roman tribunals, were exact and authentic copies of those books. At the outset of the correspondence, I have no doubt he was convinced that his authorities were good, and his case easily established; and I am certain that he anticipated an easy and a glorious triumph. Mr. Fuller has not studied those quotations with sufficient care, and he was not prepared for the difficulties that subsequently arose. The forgeries and the interpolations are not his. And it was neither the disposition nor the interest of those whom he regarded as high authority to admit, that they were not what the Catholic world always proclaimed them to be, spurious suppositions. Nor is Mr. Fuller the only one of our fellow-citizens who looked upon the position which he undertook to defend, as impregnable. The delusion is spread widely abroad, not only amongst those who are poorly informed, but amongst those who are otherwise learned and worthy of esteem for their genius and acquirements. Nor is it to be destroyed in a day, nor in a month, nor in a year. But I am happy to perceive that the mind of America is awakened to the subject; and the result of investigation will be the discovery of truth. In the process of the inquiry, I felt it to be my duty to treat this gentleman as one who combated for what he considered to be the truth; though I regret much that he has introduced other topics, and treated them in a spirit which I cannot admire. As, however, the main question has been departed from, and other duties press upon me, I shall discontinue the discussion as soon as I can.[22]

Breckenridge attempted in his Baltimore *Literary and Religious Magazine* to take the controversy out of Fuller's hands. About half way through the series of letters, the Charleston *Courier* closed the discussion, stating that it would only print the letters which were

[21] *Ibid.*, p. 138.
[22] *Ibid.*, p. 193.

to follow as paid advertisements. This was a costly procedure, and Breckenridge, fearful, it seems, that Fuller would not continue, endeavored to have the controversy changed to Baltimore. The discussion was closed definitely by the following passage from the *Magazine*:

> John (*dagger,* no bad emblem of a persecuting Jesuit, or of an Inquisitor General of the Pope for the U. S.) *John Dagger*—if that be the name he prefers, to his own, John England; is getting terrible misused about the *price of sin* in his pure sect. The Rev. Mr. Fuller, a Baptist minister of South Carolina, used some expressions not very reverential, in a Temperance memorial, and illustrated some position by the *price of sin* in the bosom of "holy mother", when down came John *Dagger* England, in full pontificals, upon him, and through him upon the whole Protestant community. The worthy bishop having long ago convinced himself that he has not a single sense which is worthy of the least credit in any thing it asserts, no doubt supposes every body else has the same sort of sense, and is as easily befooled as himself. And as the two things he is represented to love most, viz: good papal doctrine, and good liquor, were getting into trouble together, the paternal bowels of his lordship were moved to an unprecedented degree. In this paroxysm he has undertaken to prove, that all the world has been in error for about *four hundred years* on the subject of *Indulgences,* and other points therewith connected; that the whole sum of human testimony, immense as it is on those subjects, proves nothing; and that he, John *Dagger* England, is just about the chap, that will set all the affair in its true light, and redeem at once liquor and papism from all suspicions and taint.
>
> There was once a man sued for damages done to a kettle which had been loaned to him—as it was alleged, and cracked in his service. His defense was: (1) That he had never had the kettle at all; (2) That the kettle had a crack in it when he got it; and (3) That it was sound when he returned it! This is a syllabus, *mutatis mutandis,* of Bishop England's argument as published in the Charleston papers—about the "Tax Book of the Roman Chancery." The Roman ecclesiastics in this country, as over the earth, seem to have lost all capacity as well as all erudition. They can neither speak nor write, and are as a body, of the most deplorably deficient even in professional attainments, of any other class in the community. This is the fifth or sixth of them who has come forward of late years in this country, to be immolated in

honor of "holy mother." May we not soon expect the honor of seeing Mr. Eccleston take the quill or the rostrum? His canonicals fit him by this time, we suppose.

Our principal object in noticing this matter, at present is to say, that as Bishop John *Dagger* England, says the "Tax Book of the Roman Chancery" is spurious and forged—we will, as soon as we can command the leisure and the space, publish the principal chapters, if not the whole of the book, in the original Latin with a literal English translation, in successive numbers of this magazine. We suppose the book itself is the best possible answer to his arguments against its being; as well as a full explanation of his reasons for denying its authenticity.

This is a bad country to *sell sin* in; and therefore the rate of exchange of the Roman Chancery don't need to be exposed to vulgar eyes. A little traffic, in a quiet, honest way, suits the present state of things better. It is a *hard money* business as yet; and the *Banque du Pape*—is therefore repudiated.

There is little doubt that the publication of John England's *Works* in 1849 not only resurrected his name as a valiant defender of the Faith in the United States but added to his fame as a theologian and scholar. In reviewing the five volumes shortly after their appearance, Orestes Brownson writes that while some acquire a high reputation for oratory in the pulpit or at the bar, their discourses, when put into print, "leave us astonished at the weakness of their reasoning and the flimsiness of those ornaments of speech which fascinated multitudes." Such was not the case with Dr. England's writings:

His arguments are such as to bear the severest scrutiny; his discourses are the compositions of a skilful artist, who combines each part with the other in close union and harmony; his images are natural and striking. It may, indeed, be a matter of surprise to those who peruse the solid and persuasive sermon which he delivered in the hall of Congress in 1826, and which we take to be a fair specimen of his doctrinal discourses, that he could succeed in arresting the attention of popular assemblies on matters better suited to a highly intellectual audience, such as that which he then addressed; but the fact is widely known, that the unlearned, as well as the philosophical inquirer, hung with delight for hours on his lips, whilst he descanted on the evidences of Christianity, and that children fancied they understood what he propounded. This is accounted for by the plain and clear lan-

guage which he employed, by his illustrations, which brought sublime truths down to the level of the humblest intellects, and by the life and spirit which breathed throughout, since he acted, but without affectation, all that he spoke.[23]

Dr. Brownson, himself no mean judge of the theories then prominent in theological circles on the question of Papal infallibility, believed that Dr. England in the early part of his career was tinged with those opinions which pass under the name Gallican. No flaw can be found in Dr. England's teaching on the primacy of the Holy See, but Dr. Brownson hints that "it was his lot to have pursued his ecclesiastical studies under circumstances not favorable to a just estimate of the pontifical prerogatives." This reference to the French ecclesiastics who taught at Carlow and to the Veto Controversy of Dr. England's early priesthood cannot be borne out in a careful analysis of his writings as Bishop of Charleston. He never denied the Infallibility of the Pope, but with scrupulous exactness always answered his non-Catholic inquirers that it was not then a defined dogma of the Catholic Church. He believed he had the right to discuss fully a doctrine on which the definite and final judgment of the Church had not been given at that time, and for which the Church was to wait until 1870.

Where Dr. England aroused a feeling of uneasiness in the minds of some of the bishops and clergy of the Church was in his outspoken admiration for the republican institutions of the United States. Sometimes his eloquence carried him far, and he was not always careful enough in his analogies between the Church and the Republic; but he was writing not for the well-trained theological mind but for the thousands of honest and sincere Protestants who believed that the day was fast coming when the possession of the Government of the United States would be contended for between the spirit of liberty embodied in its Constitution and the spirit of the Roman Faith, which they had been taught to believe could never be anything else but tyrannical and despotic.

The best way to judge the value of Dr. England's writings is to place them entirely against the background of the twenty-two years of his episcopate. There were few who were defending the Faith in

[23] *Brownson's Quarterly Review*, vol. L, p. 137.

those days; none with his vigor, his pertinacity, his zeal. His writings are not read to-day; and yet a later writer, himself one of the ablest Catholic apologists the country has ever seen, declares that the inquirer after religious truth, whose mind is still clouded with the prejudices of education, or who has drunk from poisoned streams of history, can find the solution of every difficulty in the elaborate letters on Blanco White, or in the other controversial writings which are contained in Dr. England's works:

> Our theological students, by the attentive perusal of the works of Dr. England, will be furnished on all points with weapons to resist the adversaries of the faith, and will be prepared for rightly handling the word of truth. Nothing trivial is found in his discourses or writings; but facts and arguments are spread before the reader in clear language, occasionally adorned with imagery and rising to the highest order of eloquence. To preach with dignity and effect, it is not sufficient to be master of dogmatic and moral theology, and to have fluency of expression; a knowledge of the history of the Church and of the sects, of the laws and usages of the country, of the modes of thought and of the feelings of those whom we address, is highly important.[24]

Few champions of the Catholic Faith in the United States estimated more keenly than Bishop England the peculiarities of the American character. The uneven social and intellectual groups he addressed in his writings augmented the difficulty of explaining the doctrines of the Church in a way understood by all his hearers. But he succeeded as few since his day. "He was heard", Dr. Brownson writes, "with profit and delight by professional men, politicians, and statesmen. The humblest slave was instructed by his teaching, and consoled by his exhortations; whilst senators stood astounded at the depth of his researches, and the commanding character of his oratory. He treated of controversy without bitterness; he confounded his adversary without mortifying him; and when he had brought him to the ground, the benignant smile which lighted up his countenance almost persuaded the fallen foe that it was rather a playful exercise than a feat of chivalry." A prominent non-Catholic editor wrote at the time of Dr. England's death:

> We may learn much of Christian charity and good will, by

[24] *Ibid.*, p. 149.

> dwelling upon the virtues and self denying life of the eminent and lamented Cheverus, who was so long with us—upon the calm, forbearing and truly apostolic course of Bishop Fenwick, now in our midst, and of that distinguished prelate so recently deceased, who was an ornament to literature, science and religion, a loss to the poor and destitute around him, and a friend to humanity everywhere, the eloquent Bishop England. Let our practical life be like theirs; and we cannot go far wrong.

With the passing of John England, controversial literature lost one of its ablest exponents. In the history of Catholic apologetics he remains, after almost a century, the outstanding figure of the American Church.

CHAPTER XXXIII

General Conventions Of The Diocese Of Charleston (1839-1841)

The history of the Diocese of Charleston from 1820 to 1839 is contained in the twenty-six addresses given by Bishop England before the State and Diocesan Conventions of North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia.

During these nineteen years, two of these Conventions had been held in North Carolina; fifteen were held in South Carolina; and nine in Georgia. Year by year, Bishop England reviewed the progress of the Church in each part of his diocese, and then brought to the attention of the delegates, eccelesiastic and lay, the most pressing needs of the Church at the time. In 1838, he expressed the belief that the diocese was well enough organized to warrant one general meeting each year at Charleston.

The first of these "General Conventions of the Diocess" was held at St. Finnbar's Cathedral, on November 17, 1839. Sixteen priests were present, representing the Georgia Districts of Augusta, Savannah, Locust Grove, Columbus, and the mission camps among the railroad builders of that State; the Districts of Charleston, Sumter, and Columbia, in South Carolina; and those of Raleigh, Beaufort, Fayetteville, Washington, and Newbern, in North Carolina. Thirty laymen from as many cities of the three States were present, under the presidency of Dr. James C. W. MacDonnald, of the House of Lay Delegates. Saturday (November 16) was spent in becoming acquainted with one another and in discussing the varied problems which faced priests and laymen in the struggle to make the Faith better known in the Southland. On Sunday morning, November 17, all were present in the cathedral for the Solemn Pontifical Mass, sung by Bishop England, who was assisted by three Italian missionaries (on their way to Brazil), whose names have not come down to us. At the end of the Mass and before the pontifical blessing, Bishop England, seated before the altar, received the declaration and promise required by the Constitution of the Diocese from Father

John Barry, the senior priest, and from Mr. Antoine Barbot, who represented the laity. This declaration was then signed, and Bishop England addressed the delegates, who occupied the first pews of the cathedral. The First Convention had attracted many non-Catholics as well, and the church was filled.

In announcing the change from the State Conventions to the General Convention of the Diocese, Dr. England was able to draw upon nineteen years of experience with the partial assemblies as a proof of the value of such meetings in securing uniform and harmonious action in the administration of diocesan affairs. This First General Convention was a seasonable moment to review the progress made from 1820 to 1839, and Dr. England contrasted the situation of the Church in the Southland as he had found it in 1820 and its status at that time:

> When I was appointed to the charge of this diocess, upon its creation in the year 1820, I found in it upon my arrival, five priests, of whom only three had jurisdiction, and but two were in charge of congregations, one in this city, and one in the city of Augusta. Since that period, forty-six other priests have belonged to it for shorter or longer periods, making the entire number fifty-one. Seven of these have died within the diocess and engaged in its duties, of the remaining forty-four, twenty-six have at various times and for different causes, departed from us, three for just and sufficient reasons, three on account of infirmity, four whose departure was not regretted by either me or their people, and sixteen, most of whom are now engaged in other missions, very few of whom were by any means justified, as I believe, in their departure. Besides the five who were in the diocess at the time of its creation, nine others, elsewhere ordained, were affiliated to the diocess, not one of whom remains at present with us; thirty-seven were ordained for the service of our missions, most of whom were educated in this place; of these six have died, thirteen have left us, and we have at present eighteen in the several stations of the diocess. From this view, you will perceive that our missions have been principally served by those whom we have laboured to train up to the ministry amongst ourselves, and that we have every inducement to continue, and with more zeal to prosecute the exertions which we have made for this purpose.[1]

[1] *Works* (Messmer), vol. VII, pp. 252-254.

In accounting for the defection of those who had left the diocese, Dr. England stated that two causes had been in evidence: the poverty of the missions and the unpleasant duties connected with parochial work outside the chief cities of the diocese. In spite of these losses he counted at the time nine regularly organized parishes and five which were attended for a part of the year. There was a considerable number of stations, that is, houses of Catholics in every part of the three States where at stated intervals, such as Christmas, Easter, and Trinity, the faithful of the vicinity would meet for Mass and the reception of the Sacraments. Bishop England went personally to many of these stations, especially because it gave him the opportunity of explaining Catholic doctrine to the many non-Catholics who were in the habit of attending these services. "When the vast extent of our territory is considered", he said, "together with the small number of our clergy and the very limited resources for meeting expenses, I am convinced that it will be found that if all that could be done had not been effected, still we have not been altogether negligent." Out of these stations gradually came the formation of parishes and the permanent residence of priests as pastors.

It was of the utmost importance to support these stations, though in many cases, as we have already seen, Protestant churches were placed at his disposal so that the scattered Catholics might receive the benefits of their religion. Dr. England mentions as one of the reasons for the multiplication of the stations the fact that, in many localities in the Carolinas and Georgia, Protestants were in a deplorable need of religious instruction. They were as poorly equipped in most localities as were the Catholics, and there was nothing closer to their hearts than the preaching of the Word of God. By this time, Dr. England's reputation for avoiding anything in his sermons that would seem to be an attack upon any particular non-Catholic belief was established in the popular mind; and, wherever it was known that he was to preach, his audience was made up almost wholly of Protestants. It is evident, also, from the letters which were sent to the *Miscellany* by Protestants, that the priests he had trained in the Charleston Seminary and sent to the stations were moulded in the same tolerant and broad-minded spirit.

Dr. England could always be certain that he never tired his auditors in the Conventions with these detailed statements of the progress of diocesan affairs. His addresses had the double effect of encouraging the clergy and of stimulating the laity. On this occasion, he said:

> I have dwelt long upon this topic, because, too often, I have found that my brethren of the clergy, wearied and disgusted by the toil, and the want of immediate success in performing this duty, have persuaded themselves, and sought to persuade each other, that it was a hopeless occupation; and because my brethren of the laity have more frequently supposed that they performed all that was required of them in the way of sustaining religion, when they provided in the same manner for their own special churches, and their own particular pastors, without taking into account what they owe to their scattered brethren. The consideration of this topic, and the effort to provide some mode for remedying this extensive evil, necessarily devolve primarily and chiefly upon me, and it is in making the effort for that purpose that I have been hitherto most disappointed, yet, though frequently baffled, my hopes are not crushed. There is, amongst our clergy and laity, too much zeal for religion, too much love of God, too much charity for their neighbour, too great a love of immortal souls, to leave this great duty unattended to, and even should we overlook it, God can, from the very stones, raise up children to Abraham. He will not leave his people to perish, though he may, in his just providence, deal severely with those, who, having put their hand to the plough, and begun to labour in his cause, look back and abandon the field into which they have been sent, because other places of culture may be found more pleasing and less laborious.[2]

One death, recorded at this First General Convention of 1839, revived many a forgotten page in the early history of the diocese, that of Father Robert Browne, on April 20, 1839, in his sixty-seventh year. For many months previous to his death, he was in so debilitated a condition as to be unable to officiate in St. Mary's. He was the oldest priest in the diocese, in fact one of the oldest in the United States.

The fire of April, 1838, destroyed Father Browne's church and parish house of St. Mary's, and the old historic edifice which had

---

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 255.

witnessed so many of the disturbing scenes during the schism before Dr. England's coming, was no more. Charleston Catholics and non-Catholics rallied to the Bishop's side and made it financially possible for him to begin at once the present edifice in Hasell Street. The appeal to the Catholics of the nation also brought a splendid sum of money to Charleston, and on August 15, 1838, Dr. England laid the cornerstone of the church. With the funds he had, the work was rapidly pushed, and on June 9, 1839, he dedicated the new house of worship.

The cholera broke out again after the great fire of 1838, but its ravages were less widespread than in previous years. Again the city rang with praises for the Sisters of Mercy, whose charity and devotion to the sick were blessed with success, for few died of the plague that year owing to their skilled ministrations.

In concluding his general survey of conditions in the diocese, Bishop England thought it prudent to mention the prevailing antagonism to the Church:

> I regret to observe, latterly, that a more hostile spirit has manifested itself in several parts of this diocess amongst several of our brethren of other denominations. The spirit is not confined to one sect only, but it pervades all, though it does not influence all their members. I should hope, and I do believe, that by far the greater number of our fellow-citizens are animated by a spirit of more kindness and charity in our regard, than is breathed forth by others who seem to delight in acrimonious contention, in palpable misrepresentations, and repetitions of refuted slander. We have all experienced the affection of the great majority: let us make to them a due return, nor let us, in respect to our assailants, return evil for evil, but let us overcome the evil by good. Thus shall we be made more like to our great model, as we the more closely observe his injunctions: thus shall we, as far as in us lies, make peace and charity to reign upon the earth, and walk in the path which leads to heaven.[3]

After the conclusion of this admirable address, the Bishop blessed the assembled delegates, and, when Mass was finished, the two Houses assembled for the work in hand. Both Houses appointed a special committee to wait upon the Bishop in order to receive instructions for the deliberations, which continued for the next

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 266.

seven days. It is regrettable that the fire of 1861 has left no trace of the minutes of this assembly, so unique in the history of Catholicism in this country. We have, however, the published account of the deliberations in the *Miscellany*, and from its pages the story of the Convention can be given. The lay delegates were more numerous than on any other occasion, since the whole diocese was represented. For a whole week priests and laymen sat in session going over every aspect of Catholic life and progress in the Southland, discussing ways and means to safeguard the progress which had been made, and planning for the future. As can be seen in one of Dr. England's letters to Vienna, dated September 21, 1839, the fire of 1838 had almost crippled his financial resources. In this letter he gives as diocesan statistics for 1839: 14 churches; 18 priests; 4 theological students; 5 Ursulines; 14 Sisters of Mercy; and 40 stations in the diocese. The total population of the diocese was nearly two million, of whom about half were slaves. The Catholics numbered 12,000.

When those matters pertaining to the particular jurisdiction of each House had been settled, a joint session of all the delegates was held, and the following resolutions were passed:

1. That this Convention feels under the deepest obligations to that admirable institution in aid of poor foreign missions: "The Society of the Propagation of the Faith", whose central council at Lyons has so often and so generously aided our poor and struggling church in the two Carolinas and Georgia. We beg leave to assure its members that they not only are remembered at our altars, but in our private devotions. They may well feel the consolation of having not only relieved us in the day of our distress, but of having enabled us to forward the interests of our holy religion within our bounds at the present day, to an extent far beyond what could have been done for many years to come, without their valuable aid. And we would also assure them that amongst the many objects of their bounty, not one stands more in need of their favourable consideration, than that of the Diocess of Charleston.

2. That this Convention has felt and still cherishes for the illustrious "Leopoldine Society" the most sincere gratitude for their munificent aid; to the Council which administers its concerns at Vienna, as well as to all its members, this Convention would express not only its well merited thanks, and would offer, as is done through all our missions, the

sacrifice of the altar, and the supplication of prayer for its generous benefactors; but it would moreover inform them, that were it not for the aid our church has received from its protecting and charitable brethren, it must have, during the period of probably the lives of those here assembled, continued to struggle in the midst of disheartening difficulties, without attaining that stability which it has now, or being able to impart one-fourth of the benefits which it has already conferred. This Convention would also respectfully inform the central council, that probably few other missions stand in more need of support for some time to come, than does the Diocess of Charleston.

3. That the Bishop be respectfully requested to have the above expression of their feelings and sentiments of this Convention conveyed to the Central Council of the Society for the Propagation of the Faith, at Lyons, and to that of the Leopoldine Society, at Vienna.

4. Resolved, That this Convention has viewed with pleasure the action of the excellent Society of St. John the Baptist, feeling that whilst we gratefully receive the aid of our charitable brethren in Europe to enable us here to worship God according to the way of our fathers, as they learned from the apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to train up our children to follow after us in their footsteps, we would be undeserving of their sympathy, did we not exert ourselves to emulate them, nay, even to surpass their exertions; as in us, it would be only the performance of a duty for our own sole advantage, whilst theirs is a generous effort to serve us. We were gratified then at beholding the exertions made by this society to sustain our seminary and to support our missions; whilst we applaud them for what has been done, we urge upon them the necessity of continued exertion. "He who putteth his hand to the plough and looketh back is not worthy of the kingdom of Heaven." The sacrifice which each individual makes is small, but if many will contribute and persevere, the effect will be important; yet there are many places in the Diocess in which nothing has been done—there are some congregations in which no branch of the Society exists, and there are branches which have not made a remittance for some time past. This convention has also learned with some regret, that there has been considerable negligence on the part of the collectors. The Convention would then urge upon the members of the church the great necessity and the obvious fitness of aiding to perform for themselves, what is so strongly pressed upon them by the generous aid bestowed by others. The Convention would urge that the clergy do from time to

time explain and exhort, so as to make their congregations feel the obligation; that they show themselves zealous and active in creating and sustaining the branches of the Society, and it would impress upon the lay-members the principle, that each is bound not only to contribute, but to urge others to do the same, and to give the influence of their example by being present at the meetings, and exhibiting to others that they feel a deep interest in the welfare of the society and the promotion of its objects.

5. Resolved, That we are duly sensible of the importance of collecting "the General fund" for the purposes designated in the Constitution: and we therefore earnestly recommend to the collectors and contributors for the same to be punctual in the payment and earnest in the collection thereof.

6. Resolved, That a joint committee of five be appointed and authorised by both houses to aid the Bishop in placing the *U. S. Catholic Miscellany* upon a more permanent footing, and thereby carry into effect the plan agreed upon after the last Convention of the Church of South Carolina and to report upon the state of the accounts of the paper to the General Trustees and to the next Convention.

7. Resolved, That the said joint Committee be also instructed and authorised by this Convention to address in its name the Roman Catholics of the United States and our liberal fellow-citizens of other denominations upon the necessity of creating a fund for building a Cathedral in this city, and that they be also authorised to solicit and to receive subscriptions for the same.

A special tribute to Bishop England was also offered at this meeting:

Resolved, That this diocess is deeply indebted to our good Bishop for the manner in which he has administered its affairs, for nearly twenty years. Upon his arrival amongst us, he found our few churches nearly neglected, the few priests who ministered in them departing and the very name of our holy religion itself, almost an object of suspicion and reproach, with many honest but mistaken persons. He came, and a change was soon observable. To him is due the erection of the numerous altars that now bless with their influence the diocess. To him is due its Convent, its congregation of the Sisters of our Lady of Mercy, its Seminary for ecclesiastical students, its literary schools, and other Catholic establishments, its press and the improved tone and feeling of the public mind in our behalf; and above all, to him we owe the presence of its devoted, enlightened, patriotic and blameless priesthood.

The diocess is also deeply indebted to him for the Christian example he has set in meeting upon so many occasions the numerous, and fierce attacks made upon our holy, unchanged, and unchangeable faith, with calmness, dignity and moderation, vindicating, explaining and defending its discipline and its Doctrines, and the character, morality, fidelity and honor of its professors, with a power and eloquence unsurpassed in the brightest days of the mother church of Christendom. This Convention therefore in thus bearing its testimony to the performance of illustrious services in the cause of truth, trusts it may be permitted to indulge the hope, that this expression on its part, indicates for the cherished object of its respectful attachment, the promised reward of heaven, and the certain benediction and judgment of impartial posterity.

Before the end of the Convention, early on Sunday morning, November 24, 1839, the Bishop of Nancy and Toul, Count Charles-Auguste-Marie-Joseph de Forbin-Janson, who was then on a missionary tour in the United States, arrived in Charleston, accompanied by Father (later Bishop) Barron.[4]

Bishop England had written to Archbishop Eccleston, on November 4, 1839, enclosing an invitation to the illustrious visitor:

May I trouble you to deliver the enclosed? I see that the Bishop of Nancy was in Philadelphia on the first and thence would proceed to Baltimore on his way South. Our Convention opens on the 17th and will be followed by the retreat of my few priests. It may be gratifying to him and would be useful to us were he able to be with us when we are together. Could I induce you to accompany him and spend a few days in this part of your province it would greatly enhance the gratification and would enable him to travel more at his ease. I would then see to his going on to the more Southern Diocesses and this would be treating him as becomes his services. Do I pray you, confer on us that favour. We are poor, but we shall treat you as well as we can and you will know your province better, whilst you will give to us a *revival.*

I have pointed out for him the Norfolk route as infinitely preferable to that by Richmond. By that first route you are travelling only one night, in stages 40 miles where the Railroad is unfinished between Weldon and Wilmington. You leave Portsmouth in the morning and next day you arrive about

[4]Cf. Shea, *op. cit.*, vol. III, pp. 452, 537, 628, 650; De Rivière, *Vie de Mgr. de Forbin-Janson.* Paris, 1892. The Forbin-Janson correspondence in the Catholic Archives of America (Notre Dame) throws little additional light on national Catholic conditions.

noon in Wilmington, N. C. There you embark in a fine steamboat and next morning you arrive in this city. Going down the Cape Fear River 40 miles, 140 miles by sea from Smithville to Charleston bar and 12 miles from the Bar to this city. I have had a severe attack of fever called the *Broken Bone* and whilst convalescent had to go to Newbern, N. C. to urge what I hope I have succeeded in, the laying the foundation of a Church. I arrived here on Saturday morning quite recovered, thank God. There I hope we lose no ground. We are now, thank God, free from sickness.[5]

After celebrating Mass, Bishop de Forbin-Janson attended the Solemn Pontifical Mass which closed the Convention. Afterwards, the delegates of both Houses waited upon him, and an appropriate address was made in French. During the rest of the week Bishop de Forbin-Janson preached in French each evening in the Cathedral.

Before returning to their homes, the lay delegates addressed a letter to Bishop England as a tribute to his "personal worth, eminent public services, and distinguished ability in the defence of truth". "The Catholics of the diocess", the letter runs, "perceive and fully appreciate that whilst illuminating the history of the past with a flood of light, even in the very heat of controversy, nay contumely, you have preserved the gentlemanly courtesy and Christian bearing in your writings, for which the Catholic Divine should ever be distinguished."

The Second Convention of the Diocese was held a year later, on November 7-15, 1840. It was the last held by Dr. England, and in fact the last ever held in the diocese under episcopal direction. The number of those present from the three States at this second Convention was almost twice as many as in the previous year. Again Bishop England addressed the delegates, ecclesiastic and lay, and in this his last public address in the diocese, we find not only no hint of the fatigue which was so soon to come upon him, but even greater hopes for the immediate future of his diocese:—

Beloved Brethren:—We have come together, on the present occasion, to beseech the blessing of the divine light, for the direction of our counsels, that we may diligently examine what has heretofore been done and what it may yet be in our

[5]BCA—Case 22A—K6.

power to perform, in order to spread abroad the means of salvation amongst the scattered members of our flock, who labour under so many difficulties in this extensive diocess: that we may not only endeavour to provide for their pressing wants, but, as far as possible obviate their future necessities; and look also to those demands which a succeeding generation has upon us. We have ourselves received the rudiments of religion, and been trained up to the service of the Lord, by the faithful persons to whom we have succeeded; and we owe it to those who have gone before us, to those who are to rise up in our places and to the ever-living God, before whose view all ages are present; not only to withhold for ourselves the deposit of the faith, but to transmit it to future generations. To effect this, is the great object of our thus assembling. Let others labour for that meat which perisheth, and the partakers of which can thereby only protract a transitory state of being. Let it be our part to labour for that which endureth for ever, not only that we may ourselves have wherewith to sustain us for eternal life, but that we may be able to communicate to others the mighty boon and thus ensure their gratitude, to our own becoming satisfaction and the approbation of our heavenly Father, having their foretaste on this earth and their completion in the regions of beatitude.

The year that has elapsed since our last convention, has been indeed marked for much of that political intrigue which, in the contests of mighty parties, distracts, bewilders, and excites men so powerfully as to absorb their minds, leaving them scarcely the disposition or the ability to attend to more holy and more profitable concerns; for what doth it avail a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul? The deceit, the fraud, the falsehood, the animosity, and the dissipation which, unfortunately, are mixed up at present with the proceedings of the parties, are eminently destructive of that spirit of piety, which alone can be the proper aliment of that zeal which is jealous for the glory of the Lord, active for the salvation of souls, generous and devoted in the laborious efforts for the cause of religion.

To this may also be added another cause that has had no trifling influence. It is a notorious fact, beloved brethren, that avarice and ambition pervade our country to an alarming extent. The spirit of acquisition which, properly moderated, produces industrious exertion, and is promotive of the prosperity of a people; when unchecked by the restraints of religion, and condemning the ancient maxims of morality, it seeks only self and disregards what is due to others, leads into

the wildest speculation, entertains the most visionary projects, and calculates its own success upon its ability to overreach or to delude. This has been one of the master spirits which for years has had rule amongst us. Ambition is its kindred companion and was found, together with it, exercising an equal influence, and, if possible, was more reckless of the means that it employed. To these in all ages, as to a natural cause, the ruin of religion may be traced; they are what the Saviour designates as the world, and with which his spirit could hold no communion, because they are diametrically opposed. It is therefore that he told us, that no man can serve two masters, you cannot serve God and Mammon. And unfortunately, Mammon has been too long our master, and we have too long been his obsequious slaves.[6]

Dr. England again drew the attention of the delegates to the missions of the diocese. They are exceedingly poor, he says, perhaps the most so of any in the United States:

The nature of our domestic institutions, and the religious character of the large body of the ancient settlers of the state, make it extremely probable that for many years, this must continue to be the case. The few Catholics that are found out of the large cities are separated from each other by great distance, and hence it is at present almost out of the question that congregations can be formed, except in the towns, in more than three or four spots of the three states for whose benefit we consult. In two or three instances efforts had been made by us for this purpose; the hopes of success that were for a time entertained have not been realized. In few, even of the towns, can anything like a congregation be formed.

Surrounded by those to whom their creed has been perpetually misrepresented, to whom their practices have been decried, whose prejudices have been excited against them, who have been called upon in the name of patriotism and religion, to prevent the contamination which even their presence is said to produce; in the midst of a people who have been continually taught that they would do a service to God by prevailing upon our brethren to renounce what the unreflecting, or the uninformed, or the interested call our errors: can we feel justified in abandoning those who profess our faith under such trying assaults? No, beloved brethren; no priest who feels the responsibility attached to his character, no layman who has a particle of generosity or the least sense of religion, will shrink from the performance of his duty in upholding the missions

[6] *Works* (Messmer), vol. VII, pp. 266-267.

by which our brethren are aided, are strengthened, are confirmed, and are consoled. My brethren of the clergy feel that their sacrifices would be quite incomplete, and that they would be unworthy of the dignity of their vocation if, after having renounced voluntarily the homes of their childhood, the affections of their kindred, and the society of their friends, and having accepted the character of the priesthood upon the condition of being engaged in those missions, they should, having put their hands to the plough, in order to break up this stubborn soil, meanly look back and begin to calculate how much more surrounded by worldly comforts they would be, how much more honoured they would appear in the eyes of men, how much more of the perishable wealth of this land they could obtain in other stations of the ministry than in those in which their lot has been cast. The spirit of their state is, that having food and raiment, they should therewith be content and that they should have a holy emulation, each to excel the other in patience, in perseverance, in laborious exertion to gain souls to Christ, and in that disinterested and generous reliance upon the providence of our Heavenly Father, who feeds the birds of the air and clothes the field with the beautiful variety of its herbage. This is the practical faith that has been inculcated by him who asked his messengers, "When I sent you without scrip or purse did you want anything? and they answered, Lord, nothing." This was the example set to us by the Apostles and by those who, imitating the Apostles, converted nations to God.

Do, beloved and reverend fellow-labourers in the vineyard of the Lord, cherish the spirit of whose possession you have already given so much evidence, and you will overcome, with the blessing of heaven, every difficulty; your faith will be indeed tried, your fidelity will be tested, your patience will be proved and your perseverance will be rewarded: accompanied by those whom you will have saved from ruin, you will be crowned in heaven.

Nor are you, beloved brethren of the laity, wanting in zeal for the solace and the benefit of your brethren in the faith. Though frequently having your attention drawn away by your ordinary avocations, yet when the subject is brought under your view and pressed upon your attention, you enter fully into the sentiments that I have endeavoured to express, and you acknowledge the necessity of not only making provision for the religious wants of yourselves and of your families, but also of your brethren, who, with less means, are more in need of that ministry whose services you enjoy.[7]

[7] *Ibid.*, pp. 269-270.

He recounted the progress made during the year that had elapsed. New districts had been formed and new parishes erected in the three States under his jurisdiction. All that was needed to carry on efficiently the spread of the faith was a generosity comparable to that of the Catholics of France, Germany, Austria, Great Britain and Ireland, where missionary societies were contributing large sums for the mission fields.

> We have a few years since [he said], formed in this diocess a society for a similar purpose, but confining its operation to the aid of our seminary and of our poorer missions. That Society of St. John the Baptist has been exceedingly useful, though I regret to say, that during the present year it seems to have lost much of its former spirit, and from a few of its branches no returns whatever have been lately made. By its means, however, our seminary and our missions have profited not a little. Perhaps I may suggest to your consideration, whether it would not, if a union with the council in Lyons should be judged expedient, be more advisable to have the existing society become a branch thereof, than to form a new one. I am aware that it is not in the power of this convention to dictate to the Society of St. John the Baptist, but I am certain that its opinion and advice would be taken into the most respectful consideration by that body.

Again, he had occasion to refer to the growing spirit of animosity against the Catholic Church in many sections of the country:

> I regret to say that the bad spirit of systematic misrepresentation of our tenets, ridicule of our practices and uncharitable excitement against our institutions and ourselves, continues to manifest itself in a variety of ways. It is to be expected that the portion of the press, which is regularly engaged in the support of those religious denominations that oppose us, should seek by all honourable and becoming means to perform what they have undertaken. Were such their line of conduct we would have no just ground of complaint, but it is indeed to be deplored that too many amongst them are, to a serious extent, guilty of the violation, not only of decorum but of truth in our regard. It is, however, our duty, whilst we endeavour to defend ourselves, to avoid being infected with this contagion. I would also urge, what I am fully convinced, after much experience and close examination, is the fact, that many, very many, of those who think and speak and write unkindly of us, do so under exceedingly false impressions: they have studied only in the school of our enemies, the pages of history have

been blurred by falsehoods to our prejudice, the interests of the parties which have governed for centuries in that country to which this was once colonial, required that we should be belied for their justification; many of their statutes in our regard were founded upon notorious fictions, several of their solemnities and religious services were the farces of now acknowledged fables; the blushing justice of our own day has, in their very capital, obliterated the lying inscriptions of monuments raised in bad times to vilify us to succeeding generations. The colonies adopted the principle of the mother country in our regard; the laws treated us as outcasts. Our predecessors were few and were either contemned or pitied, and without the opportunity of correcting the slanders with which they were overwhelmed, can we be astonished that, at this day, when our vindication has been scarcely commenced, when whole districts of our states may be found where a Catholic would be an object of curiosity and wonder, can we be astonished that well-disposed persons, poorly informed in our regard and having perpetually before them the calumnies of our assailants, issuing from what they deem respectable sources, can we be astonished that persons naturally disposed to piety and justice, should even at this day imagine that we deserve the contumely of those who, as they think, would establish pure and undefiled religion?—can we say that such persons deserve our censure? No! Our religion forbids us to be uncharitable even in regard to those who mislead them, for the divine injunction is, "Love your enemies, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them that persecute and calumniate you; that you may be the children of your Father who is in heaven, who maketh his sun to rise upon the good and the bad, and raineth upon the just and the unjust." Our duty is to correct their mistakes by our own good example, showing by irreproachable lives the utter want of truth in their allegations. Our duty is, to endeavour to have for them better opportunities of information, not returning railing for railing, but in the spirit of kindness, to lead them into truth, by removing the mists of representation that have been cast around us.[8]

After both Houses had discussed the principal points in the Bishop's address they met in joint assembly and passed resolutions of gratitude to the Leopoldine Association and to the Society for the Propagation of the Faith of Lyons. A committee was appointed to secure a generous distribution of tracts then issued by

[8] *Ibid.*, pp. 277-278.

the Catholic Truth Society of Baltimore. Plans were made for establishing a branch of the Society of the Propagation of the Faith in Charleston. The clergy sent to the Bishop a special word of congratulation upon his determination to found within a short time a college for boys in the city.

Another resolution concerned the anti-Catholic influence abroad at the time:

> Assembled in the Second Convention of the Roman Catholic Church of the Diocess of Charleston, and representing therein the Catholics of the three States of the Union which constitute the said Diocess; professing, from conviction, the faith of our ancestors, in whose footsteps we glory to walk; a faith which in our own day is the unchanging creed of the vast majority of Christendom; spread over every nation of the habitable globe, and under every form of government. Notwithstanding the host of testimony, known to all nations, recorded on the historic page, in evidence of our firm and undivided allegiance to the temporal powers that govern us; still are we assailed and misrepresented for a strict adherence to our faith, and a reasonable submission in religion to the spiritual head of our church.
>
> We can point to the period in history, when the fleet of a national enemy moved on the mighty deep and its flag waved in the breeze, with a view of delivering our brethren in the faith from the tyranny of a cruel and heartrending government; at a time when the scaffold was dyed and the sword reeked with the blood of Catholics, was this combined aid preferred; still, what was the reply of the oppressed subjects of a persecuting Protestant Princess? "Though persecuted for conscience sake, we have sworn allegiance to our Queen; it is not lawful to rebel on account of religious persecution, but it is glorious to die for the faith once delivered to the saints."
>
> We can adduce testimony to prove that, in every stage of the war of the revolution, our brethren in the faith poured out their blood in achieving the independence of these Republics, of which we glory to be citizens, either by birth or by adoption; that they were not found traitors in the camp, nor cowards in the field; yet do we find ourselves as a body, assailed by statesmen, by politicians and by the religious press of the country, as charged with opposition to our constitution; enemies to our institutions, and aiming with foreigners at their overthrow. Hence are we denounced by demagogues, the leaders of a self-styled native American party, as unworthy of exercising the elective franchise, or of holding office under the

Constitution, which we and ours aided in framing at the risque of our lives, and of property: but hailing with inexpressible delight, the able and unanswerable defence of our principles, as Catholics, and the irrefutable vindication of our rights as American Citizens, in the recent essays countenanced and sustained by the erudite and learned Bishop of this diocess, this house cannot separate without expressing its deep and grateful acknowledgments to him for the incomparable services thus conferred on us. Be it therefore Resolved: That we the Clergy and Lay-delegates assembled, as above, tender our unfeigned thanks and sincere gratitude to the Right Rev. Doctor England, Bishop of this Diocess, for his persevering in the faithful discharge of pastoral duties, for his aiding in the triumphant defence of our religious principles, in the lucid exhibition of their compatibility with every form of government, and the able and manly vindication of our rights as American citizens.[9]

The Convention of 1840 was the last held in accordance with the Constitution he had so sedulously framed for the reconstruction of Catholic discipline in the Southland. In his absence in November, 1841, when the Third General Convention of the Diocese was called, nothing was done, and in the two years' interim between his death and the coming of Bishop Reynolds, the Constitution fell into abeyance. Shortly after he took possession of the See, Dr. Reynolds, unwittingly perhaps, robbed the Convention of all significance, and it was never held again.

John England's great experiment in Church organization should be judged with fairness and accuracy from the vantage of a century's retrospect. To many Catholics, especially to his contemporaries in the American hierarchy, it was a dangerous experiment. Its success, in so far as the Diocese of Charleston was concerned, was admitted; but prelates in other sections of the country did not wish it complete success lest it should become so popular as to be demanded within their own jurisdictions.

If the "constitutional" or "democratic" system of church government Dr. England instituted in his first year as bishop—and it must be kept in mind that his fellow-bishops used these two adjectives as condemnatory—be regarded from the viewpoint of church progress, then it cannot be fairly held that the system brought com-

[9] *Cath. Misc.*, vol. XX, p. 158.

plete success to his efforts. The Constitution, did, however, make peace from the start. It brought harmony, quickly in some places, gradually in others; and its action in pacifying the varied elements of church life in the Southland heightened the contrast between his diocese and that of Dr. Conwell or of Bishop Dubois, where opposition was only conquered with a strong hand; and then at a cost to Catholic unity. The Charleston Constitution had against it in the eyes of some the outstanding fact that it was based upon a system almost identical to Protestant methods of church organization, particularly to those of the Protestant Episcopal Church. Dr. England heard this objection more than once, but never took it seriously.

There was nothing essentially wrong in the bi-cameral system of diocesan government; and, if it could produce the results he wished, he felt that there would be justification for the system. "House of the Clergy" and "House of Lay Delegates" had a heterodox sound to some of his fellow-bishops. Even Dr. Rosati, who admired the Constitution and its system, was opposed to instituting a similar system for his own diocese. Dr. Conwell found fault with many things, and with a frequency that was appalling, in the American Church during his long life as bishop (1820-1842); and he was never able to speak or to write calmly of the "democratic" Church of Charleston.

The results Dr. England hoped for were partly social, partly religious and spiritual, and partly administrative. If he could make his people known to one another in those days of scattered plantations, farms and villages, in those days especially of social ostracism for the Catholic, he would have succeeded in strengthening the Faith in the hearts of these same people. That he did this is certain. South Carolina Catholics knew their brethren of all the principal cities and towns. They were familiar with those problems that were common to all and those that were particular to certain localities, and there was an *esprit de corps* which gave them courage to face difficulties. North Carolina had but few Catholics in those days; but it meant greater strength of purpose to meet each year representatives who brought back from Raleigh or Newbern or Fayetteville the news of their brethren in the two other States of

the diocese. Georgia Catholics grew vigorous and hardy with each of their nine Conventions. Undoubtedly, this annual gathering of priests and delegates was the channel of new zeal and new hope for the year to come.

There was never any political result from the Conventions. Political questions, State and national, were not excluded from the private discussions of the delegates, but in none of the twenty-eight Conventions was any resolution passed touching the political situation of the time. They were too few, these children of the Faith, in what was popularly known as the Protestant States of the Union, to have any influence upon more than local problems. The only time a political question assumed importance was during the First and Second General Conventions of the Diocese (1839-1840), when an attempt was made to identify Bishop England and the Catholic voters of the United States with Van Buren and the Democratic party. Dr. England's two essays entitled "Catholic Voters" undoubtedly influenced many in their vote, but the principal value of the controversy was its discovery that the old ecclesiastical enmities of Baltimore were as alive and vigorous as in Maréchal's day. It also disclosed the anomaly that no Catholic priest or bishop would be suffered to speak on political matters, on the score that their spiritual character forbade their taking part in such matters, but that the same rule was not true for Protestant ministers and their pulpits. Duff Green blundered badly when he said that he would criticize just as forcibly any Protestant clergyman who took part in politics. A warning on the subject was made part of the *Pastoral Letter* of 1840, as will be seen in the next chapter.

Dr. England's political principles were well known. These he expressed in the following paragraphs:

> How long will the Catholic body continue to uphold, and in many instances to applaud those who flatter, or cajole, or insult them, or denounce them, as it may suit their interest or their caprice?
>
> We desire to see the Catholics as a religious body upon the ground of equality with all other religious societies. We desire as citizens, to see them merged in the bulk of their fellow-citizens, and we consider that man who would call upon them to stand aloof from their brethren, in the politics of the coun-

try, as neither a friend to America nor a friend to Catholics. To this there is, we believe, one fair exception. If any candidate for public offce, or his supporters, shall single them out from their fellow-citizens as objects for insult or for inquiry, we cannot in such a case look upon it as a dereliction of duty to the republic on their part, to prefer a capable friend to a capable enemy.

We have been gratified with the conduct of our brethren in the faith, at our elections, where they have fallen under our observation. We have never known them ambitious of putting forward candidates from their own body for public offices, and when, as it seldom happened, a Catholic was before the electors, so far as we could discover, he did not from his coreligionists get a vote, because of his church-fellowship. We must, however, say, that it is our opinion that on more occasions than one, we knew that when men wantonly assailed or insulted the Catholics, as a body, they felt its consequences at the ballot-box. This we look upon to be lawful, but any other combination we would consider criminal. We also believe, that many others would unite with Catholics in punishing in such a way the man who would be guilty of such an insult.

We repeat then our maxim—"Let Catholics in religion stand isolated as a body, and upon as good ground as their brethren. Let Catholics, as citizens and politicians, not be distinguishable from their other brethren of the commonwealth."

We shall add—"Let them make him who would so distinguish them, feel that he must not repeat the insult to them, nor the injustice to the republic."

An interesting problem for study is the probable effect upon the anti-Catholic political movements of the day, if all the American dioceses had been organized upon the Charleston model, with annual or triennial meetings in a national federation with delegates, cleric and lay, from all parts of the Church. The fear that Dr. England's plan of organization might be too easily used in directing Catholics for political ends was not absent in the opposition shown to the Conventions by the other prelates of the time.

Spiritually, however, nothing but good could come of these Conventions. They formed as it were a Catholic week for the State in which they were held, and, when they met in Charleston in annual assembly, for the entire diocese. The young men preparing for the holy priesthood were given minor and major orders

during these assemblies. The annual retreats of the priests were made to coincide with the Convention, and retreats were given at their close for the laity.

Trial-balances of every aspect of Catholic life were thus made out in the open before priests and people, and the weaknesses and derelictions from duty, as well as the lethargy and indifference only too common in Catholic communities where the clergy could seldom visit, were brought to light and a new spirit created for the year to come.

But there was failure in the system. Though it was a failure of a lower order, it is plainly evident in all Dr. England's addresses that the financial support he expected from his people, as a result of these annual rallies, was never what it should have been. Even after his first visit to Europe when he became captivated with the method followed at Lyons and Vienna, and when he instituted his own Society to do for the Charleston Diocese what the Societies abroad were doing for the world, we can see in his public pronouncements the general abandonment of his hopes that the diocese would one day prove to be self-supporting. It is true that the explanation for this lies to a large extent in the social and industrial conditions under which his people labored during the score of years he was their leader. Very little new blood came into the Southland during this time. South Carolina, for example, had increased but 79,000 in the ten years from 1820 to 1830, while New York gained in those same years almost 600,000. From 1830 to 1840, South Carolina gained only a little over 13,000 inhabitants. In 1820, she ranked eighth among the States in population; in 1830, ninth; and in 1840, eleventh. The Charleston district actually decreased in population between 1830 and 1840. In 1830, more than half the population was composed of slaves. There were no manufactures to speak of, cotton and rice being the staple exportations. There was no other State, writes Hunt, in which slavery was so deeply rooted, and the responsibility for its continued existence in America was with South Carolina more than with any other State.[10] The slaves, the limited number of the available industries, the climate of the plantations, the conditions prevailing in

[10]Hunt, *Life of John C. Calhoun*, pp. 122-125. Philadelphia, 1908.

social life, the intolerance of the many and the contempt of the few for the Catholic Faith, these and many other factors prevailed in directing the stream of immigration to the North and Middle West. Even in the days of the railroad-building, when Irish laborers came in abundance, they found conditions which fairly cried aloud for relief. In Georgia especially, Irish Catholic laborers on the new railroads met with harsh and inhuman treatment, and at one period the conditions grew so unspeakably bad that Dr. England issued a public warning through the Irish newspapers against emigration to the South.

Proper and adequate support Dr. England never received from the Catholics of his diocese. His letters, especially during his last years, to the Leopoldine Association, read like those of a man who is wearied with the struggle of keeping out of debt. His church buildings were not what he wanted; even his cathedral was of wood and of poor construction. The seminary building, as he writes on January 10, 1842, to Vienna, was a miserable home for the training of his future priests. The *Miscellany* never paid its way. Year by year the deficit grew larger, and at more than one Convention he stated that he could not in conscience continue its publication, unless it received the support it deserved. He had established forty missions in North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia, but all of them were so poor that they could not pay even the travelling expenses of the priests he sent to them from time to time. And not only the poverty of it all, but the fact that the Southerners with very few exceptions, were intellectually opposed to the Church. The converts made were mostly slaves, who fell away quickly once the influence of the priest was absent. Even the economic situation of the South told against his attempts at progress, for he tells the Vienna officials that one dollar in the North and Middle West is worth more than ten dollars in the Carolinas and Georgia. In the decade 1829-1840, Vienna had sent to Charleston the sum of 61,000 florins. No other American diocese, except Cincinnati, had received so much from these foreign charitable societies; no other American diocese responded so poorly to its own needs.

CHAPTER XXXIV

The Fourth Provincial Council of Baltimore

(May 17-24, 1840)

"The Church in this country", writes Dr. Brownson, "owes to Bishop England the celebration of Provincial Councils, which have given form and consistency to the hierarchy and order to her internal economy. The venerated Carroll, the first Bishop of Baltimore, when this See was raised to the metropolitical dignity, held a meeting of his colleagues, then newly created, and adopted some few arrangements for their harmonious action. Nearly nineteen years passed without any other episcopal assembly. The distance of several of the suffragan prelates from the chief See, their poverty, the need of their presence in their vast dioceses, ill provided with missionaries, were serious hindrances to their coming together in council; but it cannot be dissembled that the weightiest impediment arose from the fear which some excellent men entertained that such an assembly would occasion agitation among the clergy and people and lead to rash innovations. The ardent character of the Bishop of Charleston was not calculated to diminish this apprehension. The ceaseless activity of his mind, his peculiar views on certain points of discipline, and his power in debate, were subjects of misgiving, so that little regard was paid to his suggestions, until Archbishop Whitfield was raised to the See. In the First Council which he summoned, in 1829, Bishop England used with great moderation the success which crowned his efforts. The ease, the dignity, the power, the beauty of his language, in the unstudied effusions of the council-chamber or in the conferences with the theologians were more admirable than the flashes and thunders of his eloquence which amazed the crowded audience in the public sessions. His moderation of sentiment and courtesy of manner surprised such of his colleagues as had known him only by his reputation as a bold, uncompromising patriot and prelate. Notwithstanding the caution with which his suggestions were received, he succeeded in inducing the adoption of many measures originating

with himself, and he readily modified his own veiws to harmonize with those of his brethren in the episcopate. At his instance, it was resolved to hold the next council after the lapse of the canonical period of three years; but when the appointed time was approaching, the worthy Metropolitan shrank from the responsibility of a second experience; and it was not until the Sovereign Pontiff intimated his express will, that his repugnance was overcome. We state these facts in no offensive spirit; we respect the motives of the prelate and his advisers; but it is right that the praise of originating and promoting these most important assemblies should be given to the eminent Bishop of Charleston. 'Honor to whom honor is due.' "[1]

The Councils of 1829 and 1833, which Dr. Whitfield was obliged by the Holy See to summon in spite of his objection to their convocation, had wrought so much good for the Church, that the third of these assemblies, that of 1837, seems to have met without any opposition on the part of the Archbishop and his advisers. Opposition to the convocation of the Council of 1840 came from another quarter. In one of the leading Catholic journals of the day, there appeared an article, which could only have been printed with the permission of the bishop of a western See, that ran as follows:

> It may be none of our business, but we do hope that we may be allowed to say that too much of the convex world is to be traversed, at no inconsiderable risk of life, or health, as well as expense of time and money, to reach these triennial meetings of the Prelacy and their very venerable clergy, in Baltimore. Let any one cast his eyes on the map and see the relative distance of New Orleans, Mobile, Dubuque and Maine, not to speak of intervening points, and then reflect how illy prepared our bishops must be by physical exhaustion, and fatigue in travelling, to sit in council from morning till night, for a week, and then return over the same weary track, to their respective sees. The present arrangement requires four weeks' constant travelling for one week of hasty deliberation. Meantime their mutual separation, so soon after Easter, and during many of the most holy festivals of the year, must be a source of loss and affliction to the Pastors and to the flock. We are happy to know that this inconvenience has been felt by the bishops, and that, in their wisdom, they are resolved to apply the proper rule for its removal. New Metropolitan sees might be erected

[1] *Brownson's Quarterly Review*, vol. L, p. 158.

in the distances. National councils might be celebrated every ten years, and provincial and Diocesan synods held at the shorter intervals required by the canons; and these should be, in our humble opinion, amply sufficient for preserving purity of faith, and, as far as expedient, uniformity of discipline; while they would give to our church that compactness, consistency and beautiful form which it has elsewhere assumed.[2]

Ever since Du Bourg's episcopate (1815-1826) the question was mooted of a second ecclesiastical province which that far-seeing prelate wished to have erected at St. Louis. After Bishop Du Bourg's time, the Middle West grew in self-consciousness, politically and socially, and the Church was not untouched by the current of political outlook which was then dividing the West from the East, or, rather, arousing in the West a feeling of superiority to life as lived along the Atlantic coast. How the Church in the Far West (Oregon) became a separate province in 1846, and how St. Louis in 1847 succeeded in bringing Du Bourg's dream to reality, do not enter into our story. There is probably no more salient historical proof of the underlying identity of church progress with the social and political growth of the nation than the attitude of the Middle West during these years (1826-1847) towards the overlordship of the Baltimore Archbishop.

Anti-Catholic forces were not idle once the convocation of the Fourth Provincial Council was made public. One interesting suggestion came in the foremost Protestant newspaper of New York City, that the time was ripe to call a Protestant Council "for the protection of Sion against the inroads of Popery."

The following letter from Bishop England to Archbishop Eccleston dated St. Mary's, Georgia, February 7, 1840, needs no comment:

I received a letter from Rev. R. S. Baker, the Secretary of this Diocess, in which amongst other subjects he informs me of the arrival of your notice for the meeting of the Council on the 17th of May, and of the propriety of giving early notice of the questions to be submitted.

I have made my arrangements so as with God's help to enable me to arrive in Baltimore on the 15th or 16th of May, and though with no little inconvenience, I have commenced the visitation about the middle of last month, so as to enable me to conclude the greater portion of my duty in this state early in

[2]Cited in the *Cath. Misc.*, vol. XIX, p. 292.

March. I shall then on the afternoon of Low Sunday leave Charleston to visit the Eastern range of North Carolina on my way to your city, so as to leave me at liberty to return by the centres; and then conclude after the other portions shall have been got through, by visiting the last Western station of this state (Columbus) in the early part of August. I trust God may enable me to keep my appointments.

As to questions. I beg leave to say, that since I had last the pleasure of addressing you, my mind has undergone a very serious, and I hope, beneficial change, and neither you nor my brethren will, I trust, have much reason henceforth to complain of my occupying their time on speculations or obtruding upon their practice. I have regretted and been ashamed of my folly at the last council, especially at the foolish notice that I would have some matter for the next, at the time I made the desarvation, my intuitions were as I declared, but since then I have reflected and prayed and found my place. The short history perhaps, will not be too impertinent. At the time I came to America, I thought that co-operation upon a fixed system among the prelates would have been the most beneficial course for our success.

This could only be done in the agreement made in a council. I wished for a council and preferred to have it held that I might in a new country learn how to act and enter into the system which I supposed must be in existence. Left without this aid or the hope, I was thrown upon my own resources. I made mistakes and I endeavoured to correct them. I learned from the fortunes of others the unbearable points of my own position, and I sought to fortify them. My own system was made before a council was held. I could not see cause to undo what I had done. I had no desire to urge others and I had no right to require of them to do what I did. Yet was it, by not a few more than suspected that I sought to dictate to my brethren, and my too ardent efforts to explain were mistaken to be not a defence of myself but an attempt to compel my brethren. This threw me into a false position. I thought that upon education of candidates we could agree and co-operate, but I saw that if a general system was then adopted, the bishops would be not only powerless but uninfluential; naturally, your opinion here differs from mine. I respected the Society which would be substituted for the Hierarchy but I felt that with my convictions I could not co-operate. I wished to have a general concert between the American prelates and the Irish to prevent the influx of unfit candidates for orders, and of unqualified priests, and to have the aid of the Irish

Hierarchy in securing that such Bishops *as may think proper to avail themselves of that source* may obtain useful subjects from a preparatory seminary, in which candidates for foreign missions may be previously tried and to a certain degree prepared, and this to continue only until America could draw on her own resources. In this I was disappointed. A general system for uniting the clergy and laity under the direction of the bishops in the great work of useful Catholic publications was another object to attain which I unsuccessfully laboured. The system of efficient, extensive and well-served missions amongst our Indian Tribes, was even in some of its details settled upon by the holy father upon my suggestions, as also the mode of supplying the deserted Catholics of Liberia. Yet upon my suggestion they were laid before our council and the one was perfectly changed and the other abandoned. The devising of a better system for the classification of our clergy upon missions was a subject upon which I had views that I thought beneficial, but I found the evidence of the opposed views of my brethren too strong and too nearly unanimous as well as steadily continued that I not only did not propose it to others but I did not act upon it myself. Thus I have laid before you a condensed view of what I may call the history of my principal projects.

At the close of the last council I did imagine that it would be my duty to lay before the next assembly a view of my notions and reasons upon the greater part of this collection and I foolishly and without due deliberation so expressed myself. But I have altered my determination. I find that feasible as it might appear in some infant church with half a dozen Bishops and a scarcely formed clergy to make systems and to carry them into execution, yet it was not done and could not be effected. Now we are 17 and the obstacles are much greater, and if heretofore I was upon all these questions in a minority, can I now have any hope of getting a majority. No! And if I could, would the execution follow? Clearly no! Then to introduce the question would be a waste of time, of zeal, and an occasion of violation of charity and of estrangement. This, my dear Archbishop, makes me feel that I should not introduce these questions as they have been previously passed upon. I can act as I please myself, but I have no right to force them upon others. Again, my place is Bishop of Charleston and God knows, it is too heavy for me! Why then am I to be interfering with others? If any one of them asks my opinion in or out of a council, it is a different case; such as it is, valuable or worthless, I feel I ought to say in such a case

what I think. Now I shall add what I have learned from experience, perhaps I ought to say the divine admonition. Whilst I am occupied with my own business, whatever may be its perplexities, I experience a degree of peace and quiet, to which I am immediately a stranger the moment that I interfere with what does not concern me. I have been dragged, or rather, I have dragged myself too much into external and extraneous business. I am growing old, I must save myself from distraction, and I must avoid raising unnecessary questions. I have my own charges, and I love to meet my brethren in council and I think these assemblies most useful, but for the future I must leave their most active and labourious duties to those younger and more active and, thank God, zealous and intelligent brethren who, having the prospect of more years and opportunities of co-operation, will better plan and execute by reason of their mutual acquaintance and closer vicinage, whilst I, in my isolated position, shall still as far as I can co-operate and rejoice in their success. I have had a struggle with my pride before giving this explanation. I feared that bitter feelings and mortification of vanity or of a proud or unsubdued heart, and not a spirit of prudence or a conviction of truth might have swayed me. If you think so, you will pity and pray for me. But be the motive what it may, my judgment tells me that the result is correct, and I have thus unbosomed myself to you, that you may see and understand the ground of my conduct.

I do, however, suggest, and I feel myself greatly embarrassed on the subject, that the consideration of the question of mixed marriages should be entered into. And also whether the American church does not owe some expression of praise and admiration to the Archbishops of Cologne and of Posen and Gnesen.

I have to intreat your pardon for this infliction; but I did not wish by merely writing: "I have no questions", to appear sullen and give you the pain of supposing that my answer was dictated by an abandonment of duty or a want of respect to you.[3]

A fortnight later (February 21), he changed his mind and wrote to the archbishop and undoubtedly reawakened the suspicions of Dr. Eccleston's advisers with his insistence on the native and foreign element in the Church:

What would you think of requesting each prelate to bring

[3]BCA—Case 24—T-6.

with him a report on the following heads and to have at the Council proper steps taken to test the accuracy of each and to condense the entire:

1: Number of Priests in the Diocess?
2: How many seculars and how employed?
3: How many regulars, how employed? What orders or vocation and the number of each?
4: What is the Catholic population of the Diocess, and as nearly as can be ascertained of each congregation?
5: Which are the sects? and what their supposed number or ratio?
6: How many Catholic Churches? How many built since the last Council? How many fallen into decay or deserted?
7: How many converts since the last Council? How many apostates? What increase by immigration? What decrease by resignation?
8: How many additional clergymen would be necessary to meet the necessities of the Diocess?
9: How many candidates for ordination since the last Council? How many are foreigners?
10: How many Priests ordained since the last Council? How many natives? How many foreigners? How many foreign Priests received since the last Council? How many Priests have died since then?
11: How many female religious houses? What are the Orders? How many subjects? What is their institute and occupation? How many established since the last Council? How many discontinued since then? How many of the subjects are natives? How many are foreigners? How many admitted since the last Council to make vows? How many have died? How many have left or been dismissed?

It may be said that the *Almanac* gives this information or a part of it.

The *Almanac* as far as it goes is very imperfect. It does not give the information in 2 and 3. It has nothing of 4, which is but very vaguely known and the knowledge of which is for many purposes exceedingly important. We have nothing as accurate as is to be devised on 5. Not as precise as we would wish on 6, or 7, both parts of which are very important. We have nothing on 8; is quite important and there is no general knowledge on the subject. 9, is equally, if not more desirable. 10, is in many respects important. Should you require

the information I shall be prepared with my part. Should you not, I do not intend to move in the enquiry.[4]

It is needless to say that this questionnaire never reached the Council chamber.

Before the Fourth Provincial Council opened its sessions, the prelates who had arrived in Baltimore—Bishops Flaget (Bardstown), Rosati (St. Louis), Purcell (Cincinnati), Blanc (New Orleans), Loras (Dubuque), and de la Hailandière (Vincennes)—were asked by Archbishop Eccleston whether it was their pleasure to invite to the sessions of the Council in a deliberative capacity the distinguished Primate of Lorraine, Bishop Count de Forbin-Janson. They readily gave their consent, and the Council of 1840 has in consequence a unique place in the canonical history of the Church in the United States.[5] On May 16, a preliminary meeting was held at five o'clock in the afternoon at the Archbishop's house. There were present Bishops Flaget, Rosati, de Forbin-Janson, Kenrick, Purcell, Blanc, and de la Hailandière. Plans were made for the private and public sessions of the Council. Dr. England had arrived in Baltimore on Wednesday, May 13, but was indisposed and unable to attend this initial meeting. One of the decisions reached was that the prelates present would not be limited to one theologian but would be permitted to employ two or more theologians, if it was thought expedient.

The Council was solemnly opened on Sunday, May 17, with Solemn Pontifical Mass celebrated by Archbishop Eccleston. In the procession from the archbishop's house to the cathedral, the bishops marched in the following order, with their deacons: de la Hailandière, Miles, Loras, Blanc, Purcell, Kenrick, Portier, Fenwick, de Forbin-Janson, Rosati, England, and Flaget. At the end of the Mass, Bishop England ascended the pulpit, and preached on the text he had used at the same ceremony during the Council of 1837: *Take heed to yourselves and to the whole flock, wherein the Holy Ghost hath placed you bishops, to rule the Church of God.* It was the jubilee year of the establishment of the American hierarchy (1790-1840), and Dr. England's masterly review of the fifty

---

[4]BCA—Case 24—T-7.
[5]Shea, *op. cit.*, vol. III, p. 660.

years that had passed was considered at the time one of his most eloquent sermons.

At the end of the sermon, those prelates who had not taken the oath came forward and performed this solemn act: Bishop de Forbin-Janson; Bishop Portier who was attending his first Council; Bishop Loras, who had been consecrated for the new See of Dubuque (December 10, 1837); Bishop Richard Pius Miles, who had been consecrated first Bishop of Nashville (September 16, 1838); and Bishop de la Hailandière, who had succeeded Bishop Bruté in the See of Vincennes (August 18, 1839). Detroit had not been filled at the time and so was not represented. Bishop Hughes of New York was absent in Europe and did not send a representative. Natchez, erected in 1837, was not filled at the time.

Bishops Rosati and Fenwick were appointed Promoters, and the Rev. Doctors Damphoux and Charles I. White were made Secretaries. The latter two clergymen had acted in this capacity in the Council of 1837; and the same priests who had been masters of ceremonies and cantors in 1837 were reappointed, with Father James B. Donelan as assistant-master of ceremonies.

At the first private session on Monday, May 18, Bishop Fenwick, acting upon Dr. England's suggestion, proposed to the Fathers that in the future only those priests who were citizens of the United States should be nominated for episcopal Sees, and the motion was carried. The See of Pittsburgh, against the erection of which Dr. England had voted in 1837, was again considered and it was agreed that it should be recommended to Rome for immediate erection. Bishop Kenrick, in agreement with Bishops Blanc and Loras, protested, as Dr. England had done in 1833, against the method of designating the Promoters of the Council, as not being in accordance with the laws governing Provincial Councils. At the first public session, held in the cathedral, on Monday afternoon, at four o'clock, the following clergymen were present: Father Charles P. Montgomery, O.P., Provincial of the Dominicans, Father Joseph Prost, C.SS.R., Superior of the Redemptorists; Fathers Deluol, S. S., Chanche, S.S., and Kenney, S.J., as theologians to the Archbishop of Baltimore; and the following theologians to the different bishops: Peter Chazelle, S.J. (Flaget); John Power and John Barry (England); Joseph Lutz (Rosati); Vincent Badin (de Forbin-Janson);

Henry Coskery (Fenwick); Michael O'Connor (Kenrick); John McElroy, S.J. (Purcell); John Bouillier, C.M. (Blanc); Gilbert Raymond (Loras); Benedict Mayor (Miles), and Peter Lefebvre (Hailandière).

In the early morning of Thursday, before the second private congregation was held, Dr. England preached in the cathedral, which was filled to hear him, "On the nature and permanency of the apostolic commission, the infallibility of the Church, and the unchanged and unchanging doctrine of the Church." The first matter taken up in the morning session was a petition presented by Bishop England from some naval officers who were practical Catholics, for a special prayer-book for their use. Letters were read from a group of Catholic citizens of Springfield, Illinois, requesting the Fathers of the Council to recommend to the Holy See the erection of a bishopric in that city. The Fathers decided that the time had not come for the new See, and the request was declined. Bishop Flaget had written to Rome asking that his episcopal See be translated from Bardstown to Louisville. The Holy See had sent the letter to the Council for deliberation, and the suggestion met with the approval of the Fathers, but the time of the translation was left to the Holy See.

One of the interesting and at the same time valuable reports presented at the Council was that by Father Verhaegen, S. J., Superior of the Missouri Jesuits, on the Indian missions. These missions were confided in 1833 (over the protest of Dr. England, who was the first to bring their condition to the attention of the Holy See) to the Society of Jesus. Father Van Quickenborn was placed at the head of this mission band. On May 20, 1836, he set out with another Father and ten lay-brothers for the Indian country, and arrived at his destination among the Kickapoos on June 1 of that year.[6]

---

[6]The work among the Indian tribes by Catholic missionaries, especially by the Jesuits, has not yet been adequately studied. De Smet's *Oregon Missions*, and his *Western Missions and Missionaries*, are of value for the period following the Council of 1840. Shea's *History of the Catholic Missions Among the Indian Tribes of the United States* (1829-1859) is probably his best work, but it is a book written for popular reading, (cf. Guilday, *Life of John Gilmary Shea*, pp. 37-39. New York, 1926). Graves' *Life and Letters of the Jesuits at Osage Mission* (St. Paul, Kansas, 1916), needs to be supplemented with the articles which appeared in the *St. Louis Cath. Hist. Rev.* for 1922. A good

The question of erecting a See in Wisconsin was raised by some of the bishops but was not decided upon; it was finally agreed to restore the Richmond Diocese to the American hierarchy. Bishop Kenrick pleaded for the erection of the See of Pittsburgh, and there was some question of dividing the Diocese of Charleston. Among the other matters discussed by the prelates was a request from Bishop Rese that Bishop Count de Forbin-Janson accept powers as Vicar-General of the See of Detroit. The prelates were not willing to permit such a curious appointment, and the idea was dropped. Bishop England preached a third time in the cathedral on Tuesday, May 19, and was scheduled to give an open-air sermon the following afternoon.

In the third private session, held on Wednesday afternoon, the first five decrees of the Council were voted upon and passed. These decrees regulated: I. In mixed marriages, no sacred rites or vestments were to be used, and priests were to instruct the faithful on the grave evils which so often result from these marriages. In every case security was to be given for the Catholic education of the children, and a solemn promise on this score was to be given by the non-Catholic party. It was understood that in performing mixed marriages, priests were permitted to wear the soutane, and bishops their ordinary house dress. II. The enactment of the first canon of the First Provincial Council was requested, to the effect that each congregation was to have but one pastor, the assistants being forbidden to enroach upon his rights and jurisdiction in any way. III. The problem of stole-fees was regulated. IV. The faithful were admonished to keep the Lord's Day in peace and quiet, and to spend it in attendance at Mass, at the sermon, at catechetical instructions, etc. They were warned, especially, not to frequent saloons on Sunday. V. Temperance societies were recommended to the faithful. The stirring news of Father Theobald Mathew's cru-

---

example of the wealth of untouched material is Garraghan, *The Kickapoo Mission*, *ibid.*, vol. IV, pp. 24-50, and *The Potawatomi Mission of Council Bluffs*, by the same writer (*ibid.*, vol. III, 155-173). Father Rothensteiner has given a general survey in his *Early Missionary Efforts Among the Indians* (*ibid.*, vol. II, pp. 57-95). Father Van Quickenborn's Report to the Council referred to in the text, will be found in the *Cath. Misc.*, vol. XIX, p. 367. The archives of the Office of Indian Affairs (Dept. of the Interior), in Washington, D. C., are well arranged and contain many letters from Catholic missionaries. (Cf. Van Tyne-Leland, *The Archives of Washington, D. C.*, 1904).

sade against intemperance in Ireland was to be found week by week in all the Catholic journals here during 1838-1846, and, when he came to the United States in 1843, his marvelous success was due in great measure to the temperance societies which were begun in our Catholic parishes shortly after the close of the Council of 1840.

It was also ordered that the *Acta et Decreta* of the first four Provincial Councils should be printed as soon as the Holy See had approved the decrees of the Council of 1840. A thousand copies were to be published and a good index added, so that the volume would be serviceable to the clergy.

At the third public session, on May 20, an interesting discussion took place, led by the Rev. Dr. Moriarty, Superior of the Augustinians in the United States, on the question of the National Schools in Ireland. The opposition of the Archbishop of Tuam to the National Education Act was accentuated by the fact that the greater number of the Irish bishops had given the plan their sanction. Dr. Moriarty wished for an expression of opinion from the Fathers of the Council, and they were almost unanimous in favor of the principle for which Archbishop MacHale stood. That same principle, Catholic schools for Catholic children under Catholic auspices, was involved in Catholic progress in this country, and it was known at the time in Baltimore that the Fathers would most likely legislate on the question, though without any direct reference to Ireland.

On Thursday, May 21, Bishop Hailandière celebrated the customary Solemn Mass of Requiem for the deceased prelates and clergy of the American Church. But one prelate had died since 1837, Simon Bruté, first Bishop of Vincennes, who passed away on June 20, 1839, in his sixtieth year, and in the fifth year of his episcopate. Bishop Bruté had made an appeal to Rome shortly after the Council of 1837 to furnish him with a coadjutor, in case he should succumb to what he knew was a fatal illness. He had caught a severe cold while riding on the outside of a stage coach in Ohio on his way to the Council of 1837, and the physicians pronounced him incurably afflicted with consumption.[7] He proposed for the post Father Benjamin Petit, S.J., Father Celestin de la Hailandière, of the Diocese of Rennes, who was his Vicar-General,

[7]Cf. Bayley, *Life of Bishop Bruté*, p. 97.

and Father Ignatius Reynolds of Bardstown. Father Petit was excluded by the General of the Society. Father Reynolds was excluded by Archbishop Eccleston on the score that he held advanced republican ideas on church government, and that he was rather boisterous in his Americanism. Bishop Rosati also objected to Reynolds because of certain acts of stubbornness he had shown towards the venerable Dr. Flaget. Bishop England voted against Reynolds (who was to be his successor in Charleston), because it was common talk that the young priest was anxious to wear the mitre. The archbishop was in favor of Hailandière. Dr. Rosati favored Hailandière because of his learning and sanctity, but Bishop England opposed his election because he was unable to speak English correctly; for which reason, said the Bishop of Charleston, "*mihi videtur omnino hisce regionibus ineptus.*"[8] Bishop-Elect Hailandière was in France when the news reached him of Dr. Bruté's death and of his own appointment as coadjutor to Vincennes. He was consecrated at Paris on August 18, 1839, by Bishop de Forbin-Janson. He reached Vincennes the following November.

On Thursday afternoon the assembled prelates attended the cornerstone-laying of St. Vincent's Church, "in Front Street, Old Town", which was being erected by Father John Gildea. Bishop England preached on this occasion. Rain came on during the sermon, and he promised to finish his discourse the next evening in the cathedral.

At the fourth private session, the Fathers drew up a petition asking for the abrogation of the fast on the Vigil of the Feast of Sts. Peter and Paul, and the extension in perpetuity of the concession granted in 1834 regarding the abrogation of the abstinence on Saturdays.

Several questions arose which have not found their way into the official Acts of the Council. Among these was the formal request of the Western bishops for the erection of a second province in the United States. Nothing came of the discussion, but the request foreshadowed the erection of the Metropolitan See of St. Louis seven years later. A further question was that concerning the Church's attitude toward secret societies, such as Freemasons, Odd Fellows, and similar organizations, and it was decided that the re-

[8]Prop. Arch., *Atti*, 1839.

fusal of the Sacraments to Catholics belonging to these societies would be enacted into a decree. Particular reference was made in the discussion on this decree regarding clubs, formed mostly through the influence of saloon-keepers, among the laborers on public works, such as the canals and railroads. Societies of this description were formed by grog-sellers to provide meetings and to induce drinking for their profit, and thus destroy the soul and body of the unfortunate laborer.

Dr. England was not satisfied with the hasty methods followed in the Council. Surely, he says, "one week in three years is by no means sufficient to transact the business of this large ecclesiastical province, even with the acknowledged assiduity and industry of the bishops. Many things are passed over lightly, and several that ought to be examined are laid aside."[9]

The decrees enacted at this session were: VI. The danger to Catholic boys and girls in the public schools where they were designedly trained to listen to the Protestant Bible, recite Protestant prayers and sing Protestant hymns, was recognized, and pastors were exhorted to make every effort to secure Catholic education for the young. The Catholic clergy and the parents of Catholic children were warned that they were neglecting their rights as citizens in allowing the public schools to be used as annexes to the Protestant churches. VII. The rule of the Church regarding secret societies was to be announced from time to time and the faithful were warned that the law regarding the Sacraments in such cases would be carried out without exception. VIII. Ecclesiastical property was to be safeguarded to the diocese by civil law, and where this was not possible, the bishops were to offset beforehand, by a last will and testament, the evils which had happened in the past. Priests were not allowed in the future to hold any ecclesiastical property in their own name. IX. Registers of ordinations and of the acceptance of priests into the diocese were to be scrupulously kept, and the various offices held by the clergy were to be chronicled in these books.

The fifth private session was held on Saturday, May 23. Several minor matters were disposed of, and the Fathers then determined to accept Dr. England's suggestion to send letters of condolence and

[9] *Cath. Misc.*, vol. XIX, p. 375.

admiration and high respect to the Archbishops of Cologne and of Gnesen-Posen then suffering persecution by the Prussian Government for their loyal stand on the question of mixed marriages. The letter is in the splendid Latin of Bishop Rosati, and is one of the most praised documents in American Catholic history.

A tenth decree *de vita et honestate clericorum* was passed at this session and made part of the acts of the Council. This decree is an epitome of the legislation of the Council of Trent on the clerical state.

It was also decided to hold the next Council on the fourth Sunday after Easter in the year 1843.

The Council closed with Solemn Pontifical Mass, celebrated by the Archbishop on Sunday, May 24, at which Bishop England again preached. His sermon, nearly two hours in length, was on the marks of the true Church.

The *Pastoral Letter* to the clergy and laity of the Church in the United States, issued at the close of the Council, was the work of Bishop England. The prelates were able to announce to their flocks a widespread progress of the Faith in this country in spite of the growing spirit of intolerance against the Church. They recalled to the minds of the faithful that the outrage of Charlestown had not been atoned for by the legislature of Massachusetts, "which has neither protected the property of its Catholic citizens nor vindicated the majesty of its own laws." It was a matter of consolation to the Fathers of the Council—

> That there had been no augmentation of these bad efforts which were previously made by religious teachers high in the estimation of some of our fellow-citizens of other denominations to sully the reputation of our church, to bring suspicion upon our best institutions, and to insinuate against our clergy crimes the most inconsistent with their obligations and the religion to which we adhere. We relied upon the good sense, the calm spirit of investigation, the intelligence and the honour of our fellow-citizens nor have we been disappointed. The miserable libels have had their day; their compilers and the unfortunate and degraded instruments of their guilt, if not already fallen to their proper level, are fast sinking in the estimation of those whom they sought to delude. For ourselves, we may well feel satisfied with that judgment which is rather admitted than pub-

lished even by those who through want of information, would think they do a service to God by impeding our efforts.

We must, however, deplore not only the guilt of the fabricators, but amongst the consequences of their misconduct, one to which it is now impossible to apply a remedy: the contamination of the minds of the delicate and the young, in those numerous families into which either an unchecked spirit of bad curiosity or miscalculation and reckless hatred to our religion, had introduced the polluting romances: another is, that from the mass of these inventions which have been so extensively scattered abroad, several copies must descend to future generations: it will then probably happen, as it has happened in our own day, that either folly or malice will reproduce as the record of facts whose truth is incontrovertible, that slander which is now despised. The bulk of the obloquy with which we are assailed, as the history of earlier times or of distant occurrences, has no better foundation than these. Our church has always had libelling opponents.

It is true that still the pulpit and the press are industriously used for our defamation, but it does not appear to us that at the present moment, they are conducted with the same violence nor upon the same system of preconcerted action for our destruction. Would to God, that our brethren, in place of directing the powers of their mind, their energy and their resources in hostility to us, would seek to learn what God has revealed to us by the Patriarchs and Prophets, and last of all, by his beloved Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, in whom we have redemption through his blood, the remission of sins![10]

How deceived the Fathers of the Council were in this sanguine standpoint on the anti-Catholicism of the day is too well known to need exposition. Before the end of the year, added impetus towards the violent outrages of the decade (1844-1855) was given by the presidential election in the autumn of 1840.

Catholic education was beginning to be a pressing question in 1840. Within the next ten years the number of Catholics in the United States was to be almost doubled by natural increase and by immigration; and the prelates of 1840 realized that, unless serious efforts were made to educate the young, there would undoubtedly be a great loss to the Church. The number of Catholic parish schools in the country in 1840 was about 200. More than half of these were east of the Alleghanies. At the beginning of the great immi-

[10]Guilday, *Pastorals etc.*, p. 122.

gration there were thirteen religious communities of women devoted to parish school teaching. The Councils of 1829, 1833, and 1837, had pointed out the grave risk Catholic children ran in attending the public schools; and, though there was no legislation in these Councils on the subject of elementary education, the *Pastoral* of 1840 presaged the regulations which were bound to come within the next generation. Catholic parochial schools were to become an integral part of the Church's organization in this country at the first Plenary Council in 1852.

The great problem of Catholic children in public schools, as seen by the prelates of 1840, was:

> The danger to which they are exposed, of having their faith undermined, the imperfect instruction which they receive, if they get any, upon the most important subject of religion, the nearly total abandonment of their religious practices and their exposure in their tender youth to the fatal influence of that false shame which generally arises from the mockery or the superciliousness of those who undervalue their creed. Beloved brethren, we address you not in the language of speculation or of abstract reasoning; our words are the faint effort to convey to you the deep impression which long and melancholy experience has made upon our minds; for we have witnessed the blastings of our hopes in the ravages which have thus been made.

The intense political situation of 1840 could not easily be passed over in silence and a paragraph was added to the *Pastoral Letter* on the sacred obligation of the ballot:

> Whilst we disclaim all right to interfere with your judgment in the political affairs of our common country, and are far from entertaining the wish to control you in the constitutional exercises of your freedom, we cannot in justice to ourselves, refrain from addressing to you a few observations equally demanded by the love that we bear to our civil and political institutions, and the obligations of morality. You cannot but be aware that our own views and sentiments, respecting the political parties which divide our national counsels, are as little in harmony as are your own, or those of any other religious body in our land. You cannot, therefore, attribute our monition to any political bias, nor entertain the suspicion that it is meant to produce any political effect. Our object is exclusively the respectability of our land, the stability of

our constitution, the perpetuation of our liberties, and the preservation of pure and undefiled religion.

The periods which precede our great elections are usually marked by extraordinary excitement. Associations are formed, committees are appointed, clubs are organized, party spirit is excited, the tongue and the pen are embittered by virulence, truth is disregarded and more melancholy and more censurable still, freemen of every religious denomination, electors upon the proper exercise of whose judgment we receive statesmen who may save our republics from ruin, or who may degrade them in the eyes of the world, and may destroy our peace and our liberty; voters upon whose virtues and prudence our dearest rights depend, are brutalized by pampering their meanest passions, are by vile bribery debased to the lowest grade of infamy and recklessness; and thus what was meant to be a blessing is turned into a curse. Beloved brethren, flee this contamination, keep aloof from these crimes, reflect that you are accountable not only to society but to God, for the honest, independent, and fearless exercise of your own franchise, that it is a trust confided to you not for your private gain but for the public good, and that if yielding to any undue influence you act either through favor, affection, or the motives of dishonest gain against your own deliberate view of what will promote your country's good, you have violated your trust, you have betrayed your conscience, and you are a renegade to your country. Do then, we entreat of you, avoid the contaminating influence of political strife, keep yourselves aloof from the pestilential atmosphere in which honor, virtue, patriotism and religion perish; and be assured that our republic never can be respected abroad, nor sustained at home, save by an uncompromising adherence to honor, to virtue, to patriotism and to religion. How often have we had to weep over the havoc of morals, and the wreck of religion which political excitement has produced!

The letters of the prelates of the Fourth Provincial Council to His Holiness, Pope Gregory XVI, and to the Archbishops of Cologne and of Gnesen-Posen, have always been admired for their lofty sentiments and the dignity and beauty of their language. The address to the Holy Father follows:

In our days the church is greatly agitated, and many things fill the paternal heart of your holiness with anguish; not amongst the lightest of which may be regarded the evils that flow from the persecutions which, in many parts of Europe, Religion endures at the hands of the ambitious and the wicked.

One inauspicious event is greatly to be deplored! In the very realms where, in other days, powerful monarchs, famous in the view of men, and religious in the sight of God, glorified in the titles of "most Catholic" and "most Faithful", at this time, in the midst of depraved chieftains, who are bereft alike of christian virtue and of the esteem of good men, their contempt of doctrine, their destruction of discipline, their insolence to the holy See, plundered altars and empty or desecrated monasteries stained with the blood of the Saints, give melancholy evidence to the nations of the earth, and to holy heaven, how this people has been disgracefully cast down, disregarding the honor of their ancestry, and forgetting the piety of more glorious epochs. Alas! the scene calls more powerfully upon us for tears and prayers than for indignation.

Other powers too, boastfully asserting their title to the name of Catholic, assume, under the pretext of political legislation, to arrogate authority even within the Sanctuary; not satisfied with the possession of what belongs to Caesar, they not only covet, but they usurp what belongs to God. Thus by the misconduct of your own children, has the most bitter affliction been brought upon your holiness.

When we behold such proceedings within the very household of the Faith, we cannot be astonished at finding similar occurrences amongst the enemies of the church. To us it was not a subject of wonder though it was the occasion of deep grief, when we learned the despotism of the Prussian monarch. His acts are, in our view, not to be reconciled to justice, incompatible with the laws, binding nations to each other, in derogation of his compact with the holy See, and openly violating the sanctity of his royal word pledged for the purpose of obtaining an accession of territory occupied by Catholics.

After the slaughters in Poland, in the midst of the many evils brought upon religion in that country, your voice, announcing from the throne of the prince of the Apostles mournful tidings, the perfidy of some bishops of the Russian nation, came not unexpectedly to our ears; for already had rumour informed us that every preparatory measure to insure this result had been taken by their Emperor. But though we must deplore the treacherous defection of many, yet the whole body of the people have not strayed from the way of virtue. The blood of martyrs is ruddy amongst the Russians and the Poles; and glorious confessors there emulate the fidelity of the ancient fathers.

Persecution is also in vigour beyond the bounds of Europe, amongst the barbarian Chinese. In some islands of the

Pacific Ocean, at the instigation of gospellers who went thither from our country pretending to a ministry, an uncivilized petty king was, under the same pretext of political enactments, worrying the Catholics, until the king of the French, for the protection of his own citizens, restrained the man. How different was the generous liberality of the Emperor of the Turks not only from the crafty perfidy of those nations which boast of their civilization, but also from the conduct of these barbarians exhibiting the same malice without an equal cunning! Whilst they lay snares for the faith or openly aim at its forcible subversion; he who was considered to be the hereditary enemy of the Christian name, breaking the bonds of the faithful, asserted their perfect right to the full enjoyment of liberty.

Thrown, by the intervention of a vast ocean, at a great distance from the ancient world, contemplating all these facts, and revolving in our inmost soul how greatly your holiness is eaten up by the zeal of the house of the Lord, and absorbed in grief, we, moved to sympathy with our head, were also afflicted and we besought the Lord in most earnest prayers, that you, our protection and our ornament, may be strengthened with grace from on high, to the end that the whole house of God should be preserved in safety. Our hearts received very sweet consolation and we felt our best support in the midst of our own difficulties, when we beheld in your holiness the bright example of calm firmness, unconquerable meekness, immovable faith and an unvanquished fortitude, resting upon true humility. Then we recognized the right hand of the Saviour, sustaining Peter on the unsteady waters of this world, and guiding him to a solid shore; we remembered his word: *Upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall never prevail against it*, and again, *Behold I am with you all days even unto the end of the world.* The heavens and the earth may pass away, but the words of Christ our Lord will not pass away. Let the rains then fall; let the winds blow; let the thunders growl and the floods sweep away all things merely of this earth; that house which the wise builder constructed with his heavenly hand upon this rock will remain ever unmoved amidst the waves of the wild deluge.

Thus during eighteen centuries, since the time that the Galilean fisherman received the keys from the hand of Jesus, that he should be made the prince of the Apostles, to govern the Christian people, *have the nations raged and the people devised vain things: the kings of the earth stood up, and the princes met together against the Lord and against his Christ. He that dwelleth in Heaven laughed at them, and the Lord*

derided them. Where are now those mighty ones? Like to *the Giants, those renowned men that were from the beginning, expert in war. The Lord chose them not, neither did they find the way of knowledge: therefore did they perish: and because they had not wisdom, they perished through their folly.* We, we ourselves have seen him to whom it was given for a time to glory in malice, him who amused himself with diadems as with toys, we have seen him mighty in iniquity, assail the holy See, lay sacrilegious hands upon the patrimony of Peter, thrust dishonoured into prison your predecessor of blessed memory; we have seen him shaken from his throne by the hand of God, we have seen him in disgraceful flight, a captive, bound, in the view of the whole world, to a rock in the midst of the waters, wasting away his life wretchedly for years, until death put a period to his sighs! Where then; holy Father! where are they to be found, who, relying upon the sword, oppressed the church? From the rubbish of Nero's tomb, the traveller beholds the mausoleum of the Vatican! Look at the cliffs of St. Helena, whilst amidst the applause of the christian world, Rome, exulting in triumph, receives to her bosom Pius returning from his exile! Through the ages that have intervened, how many and how mighty were the tyrants who, filled by the lust of domineering over the Lord's heritage, have basely fallen? Today, how many millions uphold the chair of Peter!

Amongst those, who, in our times, emulating the fortitude of the ancient martyrs, have cast themselves before tyrants to contend for faith, and to guard discipline, amongst those who deserving well of the church, were rewarded by the eulogy of your holiness, and poured joy into the hearts of the faithful, we have regarded with admiration our venerable brethren, Clement-Augustus of the free Barons of Droste of Vishering, Archbishop of Cologne, and Martin of Dunin, Archbishop of the United Sees of Posen and Gnesen. It would be difficult for us to say, whether we should condole with these champions of Christ, for the injury which has been heaped upon them, or rather congratulate them for having been found worthy of suffering reproach for the name of Jesus.

Our clergy, and our faithful people, delighted and edified at the zeal and the fidelity of these illustrious prelates, are eager to testify the affection which they bear to them, and we approving this their anxiety and carried away by the love which we cherish for our brethren desire to open our hearts to them. Whilst then we unceasingly supplicate the father of mercies on their behalf, we have decreed to send them letters, copies of

which we desire to be laid before your Holiness, so that it may be manifest to our father, that his sons, however separated by waters, by forms of civil government and the like, are most perfectly knit together in faith, and in charity, and burn with a holy zeal to maintain the rights and to preserve the honors of the church, and of its head.

Meantime, from our hearts, beseeching the bestower of every good gift, to extend to your Holiness all health and happiness we intreat the Apostolical blessing for ourselves and for our flocks.

Given at Baltimore, in Provincial Council, this 24th day of May, in the year of Salvation, 1840.[11]

In the correspondence which passed between the Holy See and the Archbishop of Baltimore as the result of the Council, there is a decree from the Sacred Congregation, dated December 15, 1840, regulating rigorously the security of ecclesiastical property in the United States. Instead of protecting church property from alienation, the clauses laid down in the decree made the incorporation and bequest of these so burdensome and obnoxious that a change was asked and obtained by the next Council (1843).

With the beginning of the New Year (1841), the Church in the United States consisted of 512 churches, with 394 missions attached to the same; 545 priests; some twenty-four colleges, with 1,593 young men as students; thirty-one academies for girls, with 2,782 girls in attendance; 72 charitable institutions; and 33 religious associations of various kinds. The Catholic population was estimated at the time as 1,300,000.[12]

After his return to Charleston at the close of the Council, Bishop England spent the months of June and July (1840) in completing the annual Visitation of his diocese. The political turmoil of the presidential election of 1840 in which Van Buren lost to Harrison of Tippecanoe fame, was not without its religious animosity. In the *Miscellany* for December 14, 1833, Dr. England accused Van Buren of political intolerance on account of the stand the latter was supposed to have taken in 1806 in the effort to exclude Francis Cooper from the legislature of New York because of the test oath, then a part of the State Constitution. The friends of Van Buren appealed

[11]Cited in the *Cath. Misc.*, vol. XIX, p. 394; the Latin copy will be found in the *Conc. Balt. habita etc.*, pp. 175-179.

[12]*Works* (Messmer), vol. V, p. 21.

to Bishop England during the campaign of 1840 to deny the charge, while the friends of General Harrison wished to secure a reiteration of the charge for political purposes. Dr. England received his information from Father Hurley, O.S.A., while he was in Philadelphia in 1821, and also was assured by Mr. Cooper himself that the charge was correct. Van Buren's friends, fearing the effect of Dr. England's influence on Catholic voters, claimed that Van Buren was not in public life at the time of Cooper's election to the New York Assembly.

The fact is that Dr. England had been misled in the name of the assemblymen who opposed the abolition of the test oath. He became aware of this in 1834, but did not publish a retraction of the charge at the time. He stated his reason in a letter to the *Miscellany* (July 18, 1840), as follows: "I thought the statement had passed away from the minds of those who read it, and I felt a great reluctance to come before the public with what I considered a valueless certificate in a political contest." When he found, however, that political use was being made of his mistake, he issued a retractation in which he said:

> I find that my mistake is used for the purpose of influencing a large body of voters in different states, and I therefore feel that I would be wanting in honor and justice, were I to seek protection to my private feelings by permitting the injury of a high public officer and that of a large body of my fellow-citizens, who identify their feeling with his policy, and who consider that the loss of his election would be a great national calamity. I do no injustice to General Harrison by stating that Mr. Van Buren has not been guilty of the bigotry with which I wrongly charged him, under the influence of a serious mistake.

Some time after the appearance of Dr. England's letter, a group of Harrison's followers in Georgia and Alabama, invited him to a political banquet, which was set for July 26, 1840. The Bishop declined to participate in the dinner and stated that the best remedy for the unfortunate situation in national affairs was "to be found in preferring industry to speculation, labor to cabal, economy to ostentation, patient and perservering frugality to dissipation." This statement was given a political color, and Duff Green, then editor of the Baltimore *Pilot and Transcript*, published a violent attack in

his paper against Bishop England for interference in political and party discussion:

> We regret the publication of this letter, because there are those who will find in it, considering the relation which Bishop England bears to the Pope and to the Catholics of his country, (it is said that he has been designated by the Pope "as INQUISITOR *General of the United States,*") a confirmation of their worst fears, and because we greatly regret that one occupying so important a place in the Catholic church should have used expressions, which, however correct of themselves, will be connected with the political and party discussions, and receive an interpretation, conveying unmerited imputations calculated to blend religious faith with party zeal, and thus embitter a political controversy already too much excited.

The effort to identify Bishop England with Van Buren's party and to offset the effect of his letter upon Catholic voters soon developed into a bitter controversy in which the leading religious non-Catholic papers participated. The Native-American party was supporting Harrison and in its electioneering identified Van Buren with "Romanism". Dr. England described the situation in a paragraph which did not soften the animosity of the Native-Americans. General Green had called the Catholics paupers and enemies of American institutions:

> The men whom General Green has dared to call paupers, and whom his associates habitually stigmatize, are they who have built our cities, dug our canals, levelled our railroads, laboured in our mines, felled our forests, and cultivated our soil. These are the men who create the wealth of a nation, and who can if necessary, maintain the rights of the country in the face of her foes: but they are paupers, Catholic paupers, and they must be driven from the ballot-box, lest these imported Catholic voters should at the beck of the monarchs of Europe, destroy our free institutions!
>
> Yes, these are paupers, the imported Catholic paupers, who are to be the instruments in the hands of the monarchs of Europe, to destroy our free institutions! And who therefore are not to be admitted to the polls. And who are to enjoy also the enviable prerogative, that if, at the present election, Mr. Van Buren obtains a majority in any place where the Catholics are numerous, the Protestants are to be invoked by the agent of the party opposed to the said Martin Van Buren to oppose Romanism! This is a proud distinction. The Catholics, the pauper Catholics, the imported Catholics, should manifest their grati-

tude for this insult by voting against the said Martin Van Buren. But there is a stronger reason than all others why they should vote against Martin Van Buren. It is because when every one else called the head of their church "a beast", "a great beast", "a monster with a cloven foot", "the enemy of God", "Anti-Christ", and a "foul thing, an unclean thing", Martin Van Buren had the consummate imprudence to write, as Secretary of State, to the American Consul at Rome, an official letter in which he used in relation to the Pope the language of courtesy and respect that is usual in all diplomatic intercourse between the officers of civilized governments.[13]

In August, Bishop England was invited to a political rally of Van Buren's party at Detroit. In declining (September 17, 1840), he took occasion to reply to the Native-American attacks upon the Catholic voters:

Gentlemen:—I was yesterday honoured with your invitation of August 26, to meet the Vice-President of the United States, on the 28th instant, at Detroit.

The compliment which you pay him is one of those political movements from which I have kept aloof, though I am free to confess my opinion is, that the administration of which he forms so conspicuous a part, has acted for the benefit of our Union, and does not deserve the vituperation with which it is assailed.

It may perhaps tend to show the spirit of some of its opponents, when so humble an individual as I am, and for so many years a citizen, though I must confess to the crime of having been born in a distant land, and of having voluntarily come hither, dare not express this simple opinion without being denounced in unmeasured terms, and the persons whose religion I teach threatened with extermination if it be discovered that from any cause there shall be found a majority in favour of Van Buren, in any district where Catholics are numerous.

I have suffered insult and oppression under the penal code against my religion in Ireland, and I came hither flattering myself with the expectation that there existed at least freedom of thought, and liberty for any citizen to express his opinion that the public officers of the Union were not guilty of that mal-administration which was imputed to them by their competitors. I have more than once been convinced of my mistake; and if my religion and its professors are to be made the victims of my imagining that in our republic, Catholics, like other citizens, had liberty of political opinion, expression, and action, I would

[13] *Ibid.*, p. 39.

> far prefer being again in my former position; for the Orangeism of Ireland is mercy compared to the insolence of those who here insult us by their expressions of kindness and condecension, whilst they threaten us with extermination, unless we stoop to be their slaves.
>
> I am aware, gentlemen, that they who are thus disposed in our regard, do not form the American people, but I know that they are numerous and active, and I should regret for the sake of our republican institutions, that they had the power to work their will. They would indeed begin with the Catholics, but others would soon feel the effects of their success.

Meanwhile, Harrison's followers were publishing excerpts from Dr. England's addresses before the Church Conventions of the Diocese of Charleston to prove, as Morse of telegraph fame had proven to their satisfaction, that there was a deep-laid plot between the foreign missionary societies of Lyons and Vienna to secure control of the United States government. In all these recriminations, of which the Baltimore *Pilot* was the center, General Green apparently was not advised by the church officials of Baltimore that his attitude was unfair, if not unjust and untruthful. Green appealed from Bishop England's replies to information he had received from "eminent clerical friends" in Baltimore. When Green quoted against Dr. England those paragraphs from the *Pastoral Letter* of 1840 urging Catholics not to take part in the religious bigotry aroused by elections, it does not appear that a hint was given to the fiery editor by these same clerical friends that the Bishop of Charleston was the author of the *Letter.*

The election, the "apotheosis of tomfoolery", reached several stages of comedy, one of which was the letter sent by ex-Governor Watson of South Carolina, to "the Right Reverend Consecrated Prelate, John, Bishop of Charleston", in which he charges "your right reverend highness" with having misquoted his remarks. It is needless to explain how the sweeping victory of Harrison was regarded by those who had opposed Dr. England.

The pre-election campaign brought Dr. England into controversy with John Forsyth, then Van Buren's Secretary of State, on the question of domestic slavery. Pope Gregory XVI had issued a letter in 1839 condemning the slave trade, and Forsyth saw political campaign value in linking the Catholics with the abolitionists who

were supporting Harrison. Dr. England's *Letters on Domestic Slavery*, which ran through the *Miscellany* for five months, occupy 128 pages in the printed *Works* and display an amazing fund of knowledge on the history of slavery in pagan and Christian times. The *Letters* though never finished, owing to his departure for Europe in 1841, are among the best historical writings from his pen.

In his anniversary sermon to the Society of St. John the Baptist (February 7, 1841), in which Dr. England reviewed the controversy of the previous years, the following paragraph is found:

> Within a period considerably later than my arrival here, I recollect one of our best scholars and well informed men, in an oration which he delivered in the city of Philadelphia, stated as an instance of the progress of our religion, that there were then about 100,000 Catholics in our Union, with as many as 100 clergymen and probably more than that number of churches. Now we are upwards of a million and a quarter, with nearly six hundred priests and a corresponding increase in our churches. Our facilities and our resources are also comparatively more extensive. How many calumnies have we exposed? How many misstatements have been corrected? How have we, by plain exposition, by calm elucidation, by the very falsehoods of our opponents and the investigation of the candid enquirer gained upon the public mind? Our fellow-citizens have been misled in our regard. It requires patience, kindness, candour and the friendly communication of truth on our part to gain their affections. We have not exhibited those who have assailed us in false and odious colours. We have not gathered up the calumnies, of which the old world had grown ashamed, to cast against them in the new. We never imputed to them disaffection to our State and National institutions and hostility to our civil liberties, that we may excite suspicion and hatred against their persons and their creed. We never sought under the pretext of patriotism to prevent the naturalization of their kindred, that we may deprive them of the just weight of their numbers, and keep them in helotage and degradation. We have not hired the polluted outcasts of society to libel the morals of their most exemplary members and to befoul their best establishments. We have not burned their religious edifices and turned their unprotected women and defenceless children to sicken under the dew of the night, in the fields, whilst we plundered their dwelling and scattered abroad the bones of their dead. It is not by such proceedings as these that we have made progress in these republics. Even though success should attend such misconduct,

God forbid that we should be the perpetrators of crimes like these.

On his way to Europe in May, 1841, the citizens of Boston gave Bishop England a public tribute at the old United States Hotel, which has long since disappeared. It was in his reply to the eloquent toast proposed in his honor that Bishop England mentioned for the first time the fact that at his consecration in 1820, he refused the episcopate if he was to be obliged by the consecrating prelates to take the oath of allegiance to the British Crown. On his threat to proceed immediately to Baltimore to be consecrated by Archbishop Maréchal, the Irish prelates yielded to his reluctance and the objectionable clauses in the oath were omitted.

Ireland was in a ferment when Dr. England reached Dublin in July, 1841. He met his old friend Daniel O'Connell, who was then at the height of his power and promised him to finish the *Letters on Domestic Slavery* after his return to Charleston and to publish them with a dedication to the Liberator. O'Connell himself was then in the midst of the chief aim of his political life, the Repeal of the Act of Union. The "Young Ireland" party and their celebrated newspaper, the *Nation*, were just beginning to take a hand in political affairs. But, apparently from Dr. England's letters, the two men, one the unrivalled leader of the people of Ireland, and the other the outstanding member of his race in the United States, were mostly interested in the conversions to the Church then taking place in England. Wiseman's article on the *Donatist Schism* had appeared in the August, 1839, issue of the *Dublin Review*, and Newman's famous *Tract XC* was published in February, 1841. The Oxford Movement had begun.

On September 21, 1841, Dr. England sailed from Liverpool for Philadelphia, reaching that city in the course of the following month.

CHAPTER XXXV

Last Illness And Death

(April 11, 1842)

When the Fourth Provincial Council closed its sessions on Sunday, May 24, 1840, three of the prelates, Bishops Rosati, Portier, and Miles, left Baltimore for their *ad limina* visit to Rome. Dr. England went with them as far as Philadelphia, but arrived in New York too late to accompany those who saw them aboard the *British Queen* which sailed for Liverpool on June 1.

One of the problems Bishop Rosati was to place before the Holy See was that of the appointment of a coadjutor to his See. He had applied to Propaganda for a coadjutor on May 9, 1835, because of his declining health as well as on account of the extensive territory in his spiritual jurisdiction. The Sacred Congregation was not willing at this time (since Rosati was but forty-five years old) to appoint a coadjutor to St. Louis.[1] Three years later, on July 23, 1838, Dr. Rosati again applied for a coadjutor, and proposed Father John Timon, C.M., Father John Odin, C.M., and Father Peter Verhaegen, S. J. All three were equally worthy in his eyes, but his preference as well as that of Archbishop Eccleston was for Father Timon. Other bishops had written to Rome, among them Dr. England, urging the appointment of Father Timon. John Timon was then thirty-eight years old. He was born in Pennsylvania of Irish parents, who emigrated to Missouri when he was a boy. At the age of twenty-four he entered the Congregation of the Mission. As one of the first native Americans to become a priest, Father Timon's success in preaching to non-Catholics was so extraordinary in its good results that those who believed, as the Fathers of the Fourth Provincial Council state in their *Pastoral Letter*, that the Church in America would do better work if manned by her own sons, could well offer Father Timon as an undeniable proof of their policy on so delicate a question in church management. Father Timon re-

---

[1]Prop. Arch., *Atti*, for 1839.

fused the coadjutorship, the official papers of which Bishop Rosati handed him on September 7, 1839. The situation remained at a standstill until Dr. Rosati, on reaching Rome, proposed the name of Peter Richard Kenrick, the brother of the Coadjutor-Bishop of Philadelphia, and the Vicar-General of St. Louis. Kenrick was appointed, and Bishop Rosati consecrated his coadjutor in the cathedral at Philadelphia (November 30, 1841).[2]

The three bishops were accompanied to their steamer by four prelates (de Forbin-Janson, Purcell, Loras and Hailandière) who had attended the Council, and their departure was given an official setting, since they took with them the Acts and Decrees of the Council and the Letters to Pope Gregory XVI, to Propaganda, to the Archbishops of Cologne and Gnesen-Posen, and other documents.

Bishop England arrived in New York on June 2, 1840, and while there despatched to Cardinal Fransoni a pathetic appeal for financial help. Fransoni replied (September 1, 1840) that so many demands had been made upon his resources during the year that the Sacred Congregation could not assist him.[3] After his return to Charleston (June 6), Bishop England completed the diocesan Visitation which had been interrupted by the Council. Everywhere, in spite of the growing economic prosperity of the South, he met with little more than apathy from his flock in his appeals for financial support. The Society of St. John the Baptist, his own Propagation Society for the Diocese of Charleston, was dwindling in numbers for no apparent reason, and the weekly district contribution of funds fell so low that Bishop England began for the first time in his episcopate to grow anxious. He was carrying a very heavy debt on all the church properties, and the interest alone was a formidable burden. In an editorial in the *Miscellany* for August 15, 1840, he wrote under the head of "Society of St. John the Baptist":

> We feel that it is necessary to advert to the claims of this most necessary association. For some time past we have observed a serious diminution in the amount reported as received by the Treasurer in this city; whilst Savannah is exhibiting a most generous and praiseworthy activity and generosity. We regret also to perceive *an almost total apathy* in branches

[2]Deuther, *Life and Times of Bishop Timon*, p. 71. Buffalo, 1870.
[3]Prop. Arch., *Scritt. rifer., Amer. Cent.*, vol., 12.

> which used to be regularly and zealously in conspicuous positions. To what can it be attributed? Surely the necessity is at least as great and the calls as urgent as they have been at any former period. Our missions are multiplying and poor; the absolute necessity of having them better and more regularly supplied is obvious, and it is in the generous contributions of this association that we must chiefly find the means of creating a clergy and of supporting them upon those missions. We do trust that every Catholic in the Diocess will be convinced of the obligation under which he or she lies to perform his or her part in this great and important duty.[4]

Late in August, 1840, he returned to Charleston, after having completed the Visitation of Georgia (at Augusta the Benediction of the Most Blessed Sacrament was given for the first time in that State). He was so exhausted that his physician insisted upon his taking an immediate rest. But there was so much to be done of an official nature that rest was impossible. Dr. England was anxious also to be present at a public meeting, held at the City Hall of Charleston on August 28, in behalf of the persecuted Jews of the East.

The letters to *Catholic Voters*, and those to the Hon. John Forsyth on *Domestic Slavery*, occupied all his spare moments from September until November, 1840, and then came the preparations for the Second Convention of the Diocese, which has been described. At the close of the Convention, he conducted the exercises of the Clergy Retreat (November 11-19). He had intended to set out at once on a Visitation of the churches and stations of North Carolina, and to lay the cornerstone of a new church at Judge Gaston's home in Newbern. Though "unexpected demands upon his time" was given as the reason he was obliged to remain in Charleston, it was known to his intimate friends that he was too weak to proceed on the journey northwards. He was able, however, to resume his letters to Forsyth, and on Sunday, December 13, 1840, he opened the annual retreat for the laity in the cathedral, preaching twice daily during the ensuing week. He prepared at this time and published the second edition of the "Constitution of the Roman Catholic Churches of the States of South Carolina, North Carolina, and Georgia." During the last week of the year, a retreat was given

[4] *Cath. Misc.*, vol. XX, p. 46.

in St. Mary's for the French-speaking Catholics of the city, and Dr. England preached every evening in French to the assembled laity. The next week, the first of the New Year, he spent giving a spiritual retreat to the Sisters of Mercy, and in planning with three of their number a new community which was to have charge of a school for colored girls of the city. Dr. England was to have gone to New Orleans in March to preach at the consecration of St. Patrick's Church in that city, but again his health prevented him from taking the long and arduous journey.

Financially, the Diocese of Charleston was in a more precarious state than at any time during the previous decade; and again his thoughts turned to Ireland which had so often come to his aid in anxious times. He decided, in spite of his weakened condition, to return there with another appeal; it was to be his last.

On May 6, he left Charleston by steamer for Boston, where he was to take the *Britannia* for Liverpool, sailing on the 16th. The Boston *Pilot* of May 22 contains an account of his stay in that city. Dr. England preached, as has been seen, on *American Citizenship* at the Cathedral of Boston, on May 14.

The *Britannia* put into Halifax for repairs as the result of an accident, and Dr. England remained for a few days as the guest of the Faculty of St. Mary's College in that city.[5] The Catholics there presented him with an address in which the following tribute was given:

> Long known to us by public repute, we at length enjoy in your personal presence amongst us, the proof of those eminent abilities, and truly Christian dispositions, which have long been the theme of our admiration while your Lordship's labors were exerted at a distance. We beg further to assure your Lordship that in the reminiscences of the past we have not failed to retain a vivid impression of your early exertions in the cause of our endeared Fatherland, and that when the first fresh dawn of hope broke upon its destinies your Lordship was seen as the active associate of those eminent men who so successfully contributed to the ultimate removal of the penalties which oppressed our country and our creed. Recognizing in your Lordship the late Legate of the Holy See so often accredited abroad for the arrangement of its Spiritual Relations, we feel an additional assurance that the Depository of

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 377.

> such important responsibilities should commend itself to our affection. We further in conclusion request to be permitted to state that the accident, though seemingly untoward to your Lordship which created the occasion of your stay, and the temporary exercise of your sacred ministry among us, is by us regarded as one of those dispensations of Providence designed to animate us to fresh feelings of pride in the faith of our Fathers.[6]

The students of the college also presented a short address to Dr. England, and in his reply, he said: "You have said that probably we should not again meet, it may be so; you shall however, be often present in my recollection; and in the inscrutable dispensations of Providence even upon this earth we may be once again brought together; the pathways of life not only separate, but often at unexpected moments cross each other, or even coincide. Should ours so meet, it shall be to me a deep gratification. At all events, we shall meet before the tribunal of our God. Let us then so discharge our social duties in obedience to His will, as to obtain from His mercy the aid to sustain us in His grace through the trials of this life and to meet in His happiness, enjoying the rich rewards of one that is better."[7]

Dr. England reached Cork on June 15, 1841. Very little news reached Charleston of this, his last journey to Europe. The summer passed, and early in September Father Richard S. Baker, the Vicar-General of the Diocese, announced the convocation of the Third Annual Convention of the Diocese, to be held in Charleston on Sunday, November 7, 1841. A few weeks later, Dr. England sent to Father Baker an official convocation of the Third Convention for November 14. On September 5, Bishop England was in Liverpool, and preached at St. Patrick's Church in that city in aid of the Catholic schools. He sailed on September 21 for Philadelphia, where he arrived on November 1, 1841, much improved in health and in better spirits. His appeal in Ireland for financial help and for Sisters and priests had been generously met, and he looked forward to a new and vigorous year for the Faith.

We have no means of knowing why he accepted Bishop Kenrick's

---

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 398.
[7] *Ibid.*, p. 399.

invitation to preach in Philadelphia the first two weeks of November, instead of going at once to Charleston, where the Convention had been called by his order for the 14th of that month. Possibly it was the consecration of Bishop Peter Paul Lefebvre as Bishop of Zela and Administrator of Detroit, which took place at St. John's Church, Philadelphia, on November 21, Bishop Kenrick being the consecrator, assisted by Bishop England and Bishop Hughes. A week later, on November 30, Bishop Rosati consecrated Peter Richard Kenrick in the Philadelphia Cathedral and Dr. England preached the sermon.

It was unlike him to neglect so important an occasion in his general plan of reconstruction, but evidently he instructed Father Baker to proceed with the Convention, since it began its sessions in the cathedral at Charleston on November 21, 1841, with fifteen priests and twenty-four laymen present. Nothing was done except the passing of two resolutions regretting the absence of Bishop England and praising his zeal for the Faith. The Convention adjourned the same day, never to meet again.

During the three weeks Dr. England remained in Philadelphia for the two episcopal consecrations, he preached every evening in the churches of that city, besides lecturing to secular societies. He reached Baltimore on Thursday, December 2, and was immediately engaged by Father John Gildea, pastor of the Church of St. Vincent de Paul, to preach that afternoon and the two following days. We have an account from one who heard him at the time, which shows that his once splendid physical strength was waning:

> We had been for some time expecting that Bishop England would make a sojourn of some days with us on his return to the South. He arrived in this city on last Thursday, the 2nd inst., by the afternoon train from Philadelphia, at three o'clock, accompanied by some ladies who intend devoting themselves to the service of God, in some of the institutions. It had been advertised in some of the papers that he would preach on that afternoon, at the new church of St. Vincent de Paul, which next to the Cathedral is the largest in the city. At seven o'clock, the church was completely thronged with our fellow-citizens of various denominations. The bishop spoke from the platform of the altar, evidently suffering greatly from fatigue and hoarseness; yet he continued for an hour

and a half. The subject was the necessity and nature of religion, and the evidences of revelation, especially by the miracle of the resurrection. After the discourse he gave the benediction of the holy Sacrament. On Friday and Saturday evenings he continued to lecture to equally numerous congregations, adding to the evidence in support of revelation, shewing the commission of teaching given by Christ to the Apostles, that they were but the first members of a tribunal that was to hold this commission to the end of time, and that the mode of learning the doctrine of Christ was to receive the authorized testimony of this tribunal. On Saturday especially, he shewed that it was only through that testimony we could rationally know what was the Sacred Scripture or its meaning; he gave a rapid but full exposition of the nature of the New Testament and the manner in which its books were collected, and shewed that during the first three centuries, generally called the best days of Christianity, it would be preposterous to look for such a book as that now known as the New Testament. On Sunday morning, he preached in the Cathedral at High Mass, to a numerous congregation, on which occasion he advocated the cause of the Catholic missions to Liberia and to Cape Palmas, and a very liberal collection was made. In the evening, St. Vincent's was thronged and several hundred who made vain efforts to obtain admittance, were obliged to go away. We observed the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, and several other respectable laymen in the Sanctuary, and though the Bishop was at the beginning scarcely able to speak, he by degrees regained his vigour, yet with painful efforts, and spoke during nearly two hours on the infallibility of the Church. He then took leave and departs for your city by this evening's boat.[8]

Bishop England reached his episcopal city on Thursday, December 9, 1841. The *Miscellany* for December 11, says that "notwithstanding the fatigue consequent on his long travelling, and a severe cold under which he suffers, his health, thank God, is otherwise good." A week later the announcement was made that owing to continued fatigue and indisposition he was confined to his room. He was present at the High Mass in the Cathedral on December 19, and preached that evening at seven o'clock. "The attendance, though very good", says the *Miscellany*, "fell short of what we had reason to expect."

---

[8] *Ibid.*, vol. XXI, p. 182.

The months of January, February, and March, 1842, passed, and at last fears began to be expressed that Dr. England's health was permanently impaired. The *Miscellany* of March 12 announced that he was showing signs of improvement, "and that in a few days he will be perfectly convalescent." A week later, the physicians who were attending him, stated that they were not seriously apprehensive. On March 26, the announcement reads: "Since our last report concerning the Bishop's case an unfavorable change occurred, which has affected to some extent the prognosis hitherto expressed. We are instructed to state that the opinion is still entertained by his Physicians, that the resources of his system are unexhausted and that their former anticipations and our hopes will yet be consummated by his recovery."

On March 25, 1842, Dr. Lynch wrote to the Archbishop:

> Our beloved Bishop has instructed me to write to you to state, that finding himself in a very precarious state of health he had arranged the temporal affairs of his Diocess to his satisfaction, and according to the laws of the State so that all things may be secure. In the event of his death, the administration will remain in the hands of Rev. R. S. Baker, as Vicar-Capitular, until the nomination of a successor. In that nomination he desires that the Rev. Richard S. Baker, be the person principally named, Rev. John Barry and Rev. Jeremiah Francis O'Neill be also named not because he thinks them equally qualified, but to supply the requisite number of names. He has not communicated on this subject with any other Bishop.
>
> I am very sorry to say that very little, if any hopes, are entertained of the Bishop's recovery; the fatigue of his late voyages, the constant anxiety on his mind, and the labour of preaching at Philadelphia, overpowered him; he was attacked with a congestion of blood in the minor blood vessels, and of the digestive organs. The first, I believe, yielded to medical treatment; the other has been unconquerable. Strong hopes were entertained of his recovery until last Sunday when he was attacked by a diarrhea, which though restrained is not subdued, and unless it soon be, in his present debilitated state, he must sink in a few days.[9]

The *Miscellany* of April 2, contains an expression of gratitude to the non-Catholics of the city for their sympathy:

---

[9]BCA—Case 25—J15.

We cannot forbear bringing to the notice of our readers, the following circumstance as connected with the Bishop's illness. We do so the more cheerfully, as it proves, that notwithstanding the unfortunate differences that may exist in religion as the evidence of aberrations from the original revelation made by God to man, we can still, were we so disposed, cultivate the virtue of Charity, and of course, though unable to reconcile all creeds, we can do much to reconcile all hearts. The strict adherence to what conscience tells us is religious truth is, thank God, perfectly compatible with that affection which desires that the temporal blessings of health, and so many others which the world prizes, should be abundantly poured forth by the author of all good, even upon those who may differ from us in religion.

The case to which we allude and on which we shall make no further comment is this. Alarming reports as to the Bishop's state having spread through the city towards the close of last week, we understand that prayers were offered to Almighty God on his behalf in the several Protestant Episcopal Churches in this city. Being the "great week" too in which the descendants of those who under the Legislator of old went forth from Egypt, commemorate that thrilling passage in their sacred history, prayers were offered up in the Hebrew Synagogues by that respectable class of our fellow citizens who have invariably manifested towards him whilst in health, the strongest marks of their affection and esteem.

During the following week it was known publicly that there was no chance for him to recover. During Easter week all hope was abandoned. A Solemn High Mass for his recovery was celebrated in the cathedral on April 10, and all the clergy of the city were present. Immediately after the Mass, the priests assembled around Dr. England's bed to assist at his reception of the last Sacraments, according to the rites of the Pontifical.

In the published memoir of Bishop England's life, that by his friend, William G. Read of Baltimore, the closing scenes of his life are described with a vividness that merits their inclusion:

When the prognostications of his physicians rendered proper his reception of the Sacramental unction, he calmly summoned his afflicted clergy. They came. For the last time he put on the robes of glory, and was clothed with the perfection of power. The sculptured emblem of his dying God that sacred symbol of the Christian's hope was placed in his consecrated hands. Receiving it, he kissed the feet and said "Sweet Jesus!

who didst deign to die for me in this ignominious manner, regard with compassion the condition of thy servant; and be with him in the succeeding hour of trial!" Then turning towards the Vicar, he inquired if all were ready; and being answered affirmatively, he enjoined in a voice of solemn command "in the name of Almighty God, proceed!" The preliminary prayers having been recited, he thus addressed the clergy who were kneeling around the bed:

Gentlemen of the Clergy: It is now many years since I was called by God to administer the affairs of his Church in this diocess. Throughout that period, I have encountered great difficulties; but he has assisted me with strength and graces for the performance of my duties, beyond my natural capability. On some occasions, fortunately for me, I have corresponded with those graces; on others, unfortunately I have not. I commit all my deficiencies to the advocacy of Jesus Christ the Just; who is the propitiation not for my sins only, but for those of the whole world. Some of you have borne with me the burdens of the day and the heats; others have more recently joined us in labouring in the vineyard of the Lord. The relations which have existed between you and myself will probably soon be dissolved. On reviewing our connection, I remember many things which I deemed myself obliged to say and to do, which, to you, may have appeared harsh or oppressive. I can truly declare that, in many of those circumstances, I acted (however mistakenly) from a sense of duty; and in that manner which seemed best adapted to the end I had in view, your good. Let the motive extenuate whatever was unnecessarily severe in my judgment and conduct. I confess it has likewise happened, owing partly to the perplexities of my position, chiefly to my own impetuosity, that my demeanor has not always been as meek and courteous as it ever should have been; and that you have experienced rebuffs, when you might have anticipated kindness. Forgive me! Tell my people that I love them, tell them how much I regret that circumstances have kept us at a distance from each other. My duties and my difficulties have prevented me from cultivating and strengthening those private ties which ought to bind us together; your functions require a closer, a more constant intercourse with them. Be with them, be of them, win them to God. Guide, govern, and instruct them. Watch as having to render an account of their souls, that you may do it with joy and not with grief. There are among you several infant institutions, which you are called on, in an especial manner, to sustain. It has cost me a great deal of labour to introduce them. They are calculated to be eminently service-

able to the cause of order, of education, of charity; they constitute the germs of what, I trust, shall hereafter grow and flourish in extensive usefulness. As yet they are feeble, support them, embarrassed, encourage them, they will be afflicted, console them. I commend my poor church to its patrons, especially to her to whom our Saviour confided His in the person of the Beloved Disciple: "Woman, behold thy son; son, behold thy mother." I could wish to continue speaking with you even to the end; but a proper consideration of other duties, yet to be discharged, admonish me to conclude. Prostrated though I be, I believe that God could restore me to health and to strength, did He choose to employ me longer in His service: for it is not more difficult to heal, or to preserve alive, than it is to create or to reanimate. With Him all things are possible. Should He order that I again shall occupy my station amongst you, I will (He assisting me) endeavour to set you an example of more perfect following after Christ than my past career affords: should He decree otherwise, I must prepare to be manifested before the judgment seat of Christ, that I may receive the proper things of the body, according as I have done, whether it be good or evil. I rely upon the all-sufficient atonement, which Jesus has made for my sins, for cancelling the guilt and eternal punishment thereof. Still, there may be some things against me, unrepented of, for which satisfaction must be made in that prison out of which there is no going forth till the last farthing shall have been paid. In this case you can aid me by your prayers and your good deeds; for, although separated by death, we shall continue united by those bonds of charity which bind together the different divisions of the Church of Christ. Remember me, I beseech you, in your devotions; remember me particularly when the holy and unspotted Victim shall be offered on our altars, in expiation for the sins of the living and of the dead. I am confident that you will. It is the privilege of each of you to write to the Archbishop of Baltimore and to the several Bishops of the province, suggesting whom you may esteem the best qualified to fill my vacant chair; it is your duty to pray that the Pontiff may be directed by the Spirit of divine wisdom in appointing as my successor one, who, though he will not, cannot, surpass me in firmness of faith and devotion to the cause, yet may excell me in those Christian virtues by which that cause would be advanced. (*Asking for the Pontifical he turned to the confession of faith.*) Situated as I am, it surely is not requisite that I should read through the profession in the manner which is prescribed, twice, entirely. My faith is too well known to you

and to my people to make this necessary, moreover I am too debilitated for the effort. I acknowledge the Holy, Catholic, Apostolic, Roman Church, for the Mother and Mistress of all other Churches. I owe true obedience to the Bishop of Rome, successor to St. Peter, Prince of the Apostles and Vicar of Jesus Christ. I receive and embrace all things delivered, defined, and declared by the sacred Canons and general Councils, and particularly by the Holy Council of Trent. I believe with a firm faith, and profess, all and singular the articles of that Creed which the Holy Catholic Church maketh use of, in their plainest, simplest, fullest, strongest, and most explicit sense.

He closed the volume and signified his desire for the ceremony to proceed. The administration of the rite was accordingly completed. He gave his benediction to each one. Then, divesting himself of the episcopal insignia and sacerdotal vestments, he sank back exhausted on the pillows.

John England died on Monday morning at five o'clock, April 11, 1842.

The announcement of his death stated that "the fatigues of body and anxiety of mind attendant on his late journey to Europe and his arduous exertions in the cause of Religion immediately on arriving in America, were too much even for his powerful constitution." The funeral was set for April 16, and Bishop Kenrick of Philadelphia was invited to deliver the funeral oration. The press of Charleston that afternoon and the following morning chronicled Dr. England's passing as a national loss.

Father Baker's letter announcing the bishop's death to Archbishop Eccleston was as follows:

It becomes my painful duty to announce to you the death of our venerable and beloved Bishop, which took place this morning between 5 and 6 o'clock. You will excuse me for not entering into details. I am not able to do so. His last directions to me were that I should apprise you of having vested me by virtue of powers from Rome, providing for "Sede Vacante" the administration of the Diocess until a successor should be appointed and also to send a Priest to you for oils. He shall go in a day or two. My dear Archbishop, do pray for us. We are this morning a broken-hearted people. Pray for me that I may be able to do what he imposed on me. God and God alone can undo this affliction. Sustain us, and above all I conjure you to look to our State as early as possible. God

of Mercy look down upon us this day. I can write no more, save that I am with sentiments of reverence and affection, *etc.*[10]

In the papers of the England family in London, there is an unpublished letter from Father Baker, dated April 19, 1842, to Father Thomas England, of Passage, Cork, the Bishop's brother:

I leave you to judge of the feeling under which I venture to apprise you (if you have not learned it before) of the death of your illustrious brother, our venerable and beloved Bishop who expired after a painful and protracted illness (inflammation of the intestines) on the morning of the 11th instant about 5 o'clock. 'Tis useless to expect details from me, I am unable to give them. Never was there such excitement in the city of Charleston, never will there be such again. The whole Union is this moment ringing with expressions of regret at what they term a national calamity. In the city on that morning all was uproar; the bells as day broke tolled out what all expected, the notes of his demise. Business was suspended, the shipping in the harbour hung their flags at half mast, the Judges of the several courts adjourned, the Governor of the State then in the city to hold a review as Commander-in-Chief of the forces, suspended and left the military at liberty, and at once the minute guns boomed in their awful tone the death of a great man. But what is all this to the death bed of the dying Apostle? That was a scene which would win from any heart a tribute to *Religion.* He came to us completely broken down, unable for any duty. He struggled, as he always did, as long as he could. On the first Sunday in Lent he said his last Mass, and put himself under his Physician. Soon another and another was called in, and blinded as we were thro' love and affection, hoping when cooler heads would otherwise conclude, we could never admit even the fatal possibility, nor did he himself. . . . Holy Week came, and with it the alarming symptoms of what we were doomed to meet. That week's events are stamped on my brain in characters of burning fire. With what strength of mind which he manifested to the last moment, he sent for his Solicitor to settle his temporal affairs, and those that broke the strong man's heart with *their* nature I will not now trouble you. On the morning of Holy Thursday, finding himself sinking, he made his preparation for the Sacraments, commenced it rather. Friday and Saturday he rallied a little and as suddenly fell back. He then called for the Nuns, the

[10]BCA—Case 27A—A1.

Sisters, the Students, saw them in separate divisions. How I stood the whole of it I don't know. . . . That day (Holy Saturday, or Friday I believe) prayers were offered up for him in the Protestant Episcopal Churches and in the Hebrew Synagogue. On the feast of the Annunciation celebrated on Monday, he determined to make his Easter Communion. Accordingly on Sunday night immediately after twelve surrounded by the Priests in the city and the Students I administered it to him. The next day I celebrated a solemn High Mass in the Cathedral where over three congregations assembled to beg of God either his speedy restoration or the grace of a happy death—it was the latter. Immediately after I prepared for a Viaticum and Extreme Unction. We robed him and after the "Visita" was read, with the Crucifix in his hands he addressed us Priests and Students and all present in a strain of glowing, touching piety for nearly half an hour that excelled everything that ever fell from his lips. He made his profession of faith according to Ceremonial Epis. and in a solemn, steady voice that checked the tears of those around, pronounced its conclusion with that "sic me Deus adjuvat" in a manner we can never forget. "His afflicted people, his widowed Church" he confided to my care, as administrator, till his successor should be appointed, having by extra powers been authorized to do so, the document he had prepared some days before. "A more learned, a more pious, a more zealous Bishop you may get", said he, "but none with stronger faith—none more fully convinced of the truths of the Catholic Church than I". The next day, Wednesday, he again received Communion, and for about fifteen minutes apostrophised the Blessed Sacrament as I held the particle before him till all were in tears, as he placed us, his Institutions, his Diocess under its protection, "his God before him there." Things went on till the next Sunday when I prepared to read the *Benedictio in articulo mortis.* "Doctor" said he, "are there no hopes, are the symptoms worse?" They were, hopes now there were none. "I had hopes," replied the dear man, "there are none—I bow submissively to the Will of my God—proceed, Sir." I did. After midnight he was robed again in his undress and at five the next morning he was before his Master. In the evening he was borne to the Cathedral, where he lay until Saturday evening, the Church crowded day and night. Vespers every evening, and High Mass every day, when Doctor Kenrick, Coadjutor of Philadelphia, came to us like an Angel of consolation and closed the scene, as towards the evening of Saturday the body was deposited under his chair mid the piercing shrieks of assembled thousands. The

remains of your sister were disinterred and removed from the Cemetery of St. Mary's and placed in a new coffin covered as was his with a leaden one, were placed along with him, and there sleeps the Paul of the Union—the Chrysostom of the South—there he lies in that Sanctuary where he made known the truths of Religion, and by their vindication raised the heads of Catholics from the dust where he found them crushed by the hue of bigotry and prejudice, there he lies the incentive to zeal of his clergy, the memento of his loss to his smitten people. There too beside him lies the sister he adored after years of a separation such as exists between life and death where they meet commingling their dust in death as they did their hearts in life, awaiting that blast of the Archangel's trumpet, at which they are to spring forth from their lowly bed, and hand in hand go forth to glory. May you and I meet them there.

I have now performed a painful duty, I would have done it earlier but the third day of the ceremonies I was struck down myself. . . . This is the first day I have been allowed to sit up. My loss I need not speak of, none but myself can feel it. Fifteen years have I been with him, ten of them were years of happiness. I enjoyed his confidence, to me he unbosomed his cares, we lay down at the same time, we arose at the same, we worked together, he was not only my Bishop, but my Father. I alone am desolate, tho' all are afflicted. May God's will be done. . . . One favor I have now to ask, that as soon as possible you will send me a biographical sketch for the *Miscellany*.

The eulogies printed after Bishop England's death are remarkable for their extraordinary praise. The *Miscellany* in its issue of April 16 said:

Thus the Catholic Church has lost one of her strongest defenders, the American Hierarchy a bright luminary in its galaxy, the diocess of Charleston, a wise and zealous pastor, who for more than twenty-one years laboured faithfully in the vineyard of the Lord. Thus have we all lost a tender and loving father and a kind and devoted friend. But even in our grief, religion is not wanting to give us motives of consolation. We have sustained a great and irreparable loss, but he whom we love is a gainer. Every faculty of mind or of body which he received from his maker he dedicated in life to his service, and he completed the oblation by dying the death of the missionary, death because of the zealous performance of arduous duties. He fought the good fight, he completed his

course, has reached the goal and is now receiving the reward exceeding great laid up in store for him.

The Charleston *Courier* wrote on the afternoon of his death:

He was distinguished for strength of mind, power of argument, deep and various learning, and a bold and impressive eloquence; and was justly ranked among the intellectual and literary ornaments of our city. As a prelate, he conducted the civil and ecclesiastical affairs of his church (the Roman Catholic) with consummate ability, and has left behind him many monuments of religion and benevolence, the fruits of his successful administration and unwearied zeal. Devoted as he was to the interests of the Church to which he owed his mitre, he was yet a man of liberal principles and feelings, alive to the impulses of public spirit, and to the influences of universal charity. During his long residence among us, his high and merited influence over his flock was ever exercised for good, and his deportment was such as to win for him the esteem and regard of the community. Although his native country was ever green in his memory and dear to his heart, his allegiance to his adopted country was recognized as his highest duty, as well from inclination as principle. He sympathized deeply with the free institutions and the glorious destinies of the American Union, valuing it as the home of his oppressed and exiled fellow-countrymen, and the chosen temple of rational liberty. Of the South he was a true friend and an able champion; fearlessly throwing the weight of his character, influence and intellect, in favor of her much misunderstood and much reviled domestic institutions, and vindicating them both at home and abroad. In the death of one thus eminent in his calling and useful in his generation, his church has sustained a loss, which can scarcely be repaired, and our community owns the bereavement of a gifted and valued citizen.

The following day its editorial page contained a second tribute:

In the death of Bishop England, true religion has lost a friend, for true religion is not in form, but of the heart. And if we doubt as to the outward forms of his church, we all feel that his heart was right with God. It had the true signet in its benevolence, the dews of heaven had washed it, and the flowers of truth and love and benevolence had sprung up and blossomed there. His general character we hold as the sacred property of his friends, and would not officiously tread on such forbidden ground were we able to give it a portraiture, which we confess we are not. It will no doubt be done justice

to by them. It is questionable whether a richer opportunity has ever been offered for the exhibition of the higher sympathies in man. The country! One where the door is open to all, to worship God according to the dictates of their own consciences. The city! renowned in our republic for its liberality. The place! consecrated as a Temple dedicated to the worship of God, and the promulgation of the religion of Christ. The season! that of spring, when flowers are smiling and shedding their perfumes around us and the birds are chanting the matin song of the year. The day! bright and richly gilded with the rays of the blessed sun. The time of day! morning; before the world had oppressed the mind with its baseness and cares; while the feelings are yet fresh and open to strong impressions. All conspired to render it in unison with the character we have above given it. May it be a morning of resurrection to us from prejudice and error; to him a new life beyond the grave, where he will "see as he is seen—know as he is known", and meet the welcome of "well done good and faithful servant, enter into the joy of thy Lord."

Among the many tributes from the societies of the diocese, the following from the Hibernian Society of Charleston is valuable for its insight into Dr. England's place in the community:

In the many controversies on which he was engaged, he has perhaps left no antagonist entertaining unkind feelings. Always bent on truth, he needed not the poisoned weapon of abuse or invective. Rich in the learning of his Church; his talents, his urbanity, his liberality gave to all his discussions, a character the most edifying and dignified. Religion with him was not a terror but an affection. He won his way to the heart as the minister of God, by the unobtrusive simplicity of his feeling, the unaffected goodness of his heart. And so patient, so uncomplaining, so persevering was he in the doing of good, by the establishment of his Church, that privations, now scarcely credible, were cheerfully undergone, in order that he might the better effect the grand object of his mission to the new world. To qualities so striking and rare, there could not fail to be paid the tribute of admiration and respect. To such nobility of heart, kindred generosity would pay its homage even if a difference existed. And few could witness the deepest sensibility, and none who witnessed will ever forget the mute yet eloquent tribute to his worth, which a distinguished antagonist paid to his cold senseless remains. When life's struggle was over and his body was about to be interred, one who had combatted with the doctrines of his church, stood gazing upon the marble features, now sleeping

in colorless repose. The eye that once was bright with zeal, was shut forever upon the world—the tongue so eloquent and convincing, was hushed and still in the narrow limits of his coffin—the frame so strong in life, was cold and powerless in death. *There* was the victory of death, *there* the triumph of God's will. And he who gazed upon that body, had now come to change the excitement of contest for the meditation of death. In that coffin, was written the awful commentary of a superior power, and the burning tear that coursed down the cheek of him who yet survived, was the most beautiful and affecting tribute, from the generosity of the living, to the merit and excellence of the dead.

The *Catholic Herald* of Philadelphia said:

No eulogy to which we could give utterance, could either add to the elevation of character of this truly eminent Divine, nor could the expression of our deepest regret and sympathy, do more than commingle in that one universal sorrowing so deeply felt for such a bereavement. In his death not only has Catholicity to mourn one of her purest and ablest champions, but Christianity one of its brilliant ornaments and justly proud boasts; for who, that ever listened to his defense of his faith, and the explanation of her doctrines, but felt "That truth from his lips prevailed with double sway"? And even while those who differed from him in their mode of worship, either from education or prejudice, denied their acquiescence in the truth of his powerful reasoning, yet were those truths put forward in such accents of love, of charity and brotherly affection, that bigotry itself fell powerless before his mighty mind, and from the most strenuous of his political opponents he forced, if not their willing regard, their reluctant admiration. Attached as he was by the most boundless affection to Ireland, the land of his birth, and anxiously as he evinced at all times the most intense interest for her welfare and struggle for freedom, yet he never, for a moment, forgot his duty and allegiance to the land of his adoption, and Republican Institutions ever found in him that advocacy and powerful sustainment which talents, and eloquence, and mind like his could so usefully exert, and indomitably wield. As his philanthropy was extensive, so is his loss deplored, not circumscribed or limited to sect or party, but reaching in its course across the wide Atlantic, where his loss will be deplored as here, for there too were his virtues known, and the blessed effects of his charity and talent felt and acknowledged.

The Boston *Pilot* had the following editorial:

Gloom, deep inpenetrable gloom, has gathered upon the

brow of the Catholic! The sombre habiliments of mourning and melancholy send their darkening shadows around their altars! Tears come welling up from the heart's fountain of sorrow, and the solemn chant and mournful dirge tell that the great, the good, the beloved and the lamented, has been gathered to the dust; that a light has gone out from amongst us, which has guided us in the path of virtue and Christian faith; that the shepherd hath been called from his flock, and they are buried in sorrow and affliction. Bishop England is dead! None shall again hear him with a monarch's voice proclaim the great doctrines of the Catholic Church. No more shall we see that glorious countenance radiant with the halo of Divine inspiration. Never again shall we listen to his exalted precepts, no more shall the mind bow captive to the masculine power of his logic, or the perspicuous and overwhelming splendor of his reasoning. That proud and towering intellect that seemed to reach heaven in its flight, and draw proofs of the immaculate purity of his creed from its eternal throne, hath left its earthly tenement, and ascended to its kindred element. God hath taken to himself the brightest and purest of the land! him, who like some Christian Jupiter wielded the thunder of truth, and went forth to illumine the path of the desponding mortal, who spoke but to convince, and who shed a glory refulgent with hope, around the sceptic heart. It is the death of such a man we mourn. All feel that one had gone down to the grave, the greatness of whose mind, and whose benevolence and eloquent example had ennobled human nature. That the earth has closed over one who stood a pillar of immovable power to the Catholic Church of America; whose resplendent genius, mellowed with the sacred influences of his high and holy mission, shone forth in the beauty and majesty of a mind endowed with more than human intellect. None can feel the terrible calamity that has fallen upon the ministry of truth and religion, but those who have listened to him when pouring forth the reflections of his lofty mind, who have heard his masterly and convincing reasoning, and felt the power of his sublime oratory. Far from the land of his kindred, and which he loved so well, he slumbers in the tomb, over whose dust ages may roll, but not produce one so great, so pure, so good.

Before his death, Dr. England wrote to the Sacred Congregation, recommending Fathers Baker, Barry, and O'Neill as candidates to succeed him in the See of Charleston. This *terna* was returned by Propaganda to the Archbishop and his suffragans for their con-

sideration, and in the letters that are extant, there is a general conviction against the *dignissimus* of the list, Rev. Richard S. Baker. On June 29, 1842, Archbishop Eccleston wrote to Bishop Rosati:

> You have no doubt seen the list of priests designated by the ever-regretted Dr. England, which I transmitted to Cardinal Fransoni for the election of his successor. The priests named in the list were unknown to all our bishops, but out of respect for their dead colleague, the three names were sent to Rome with the prelates' unanimous approval. Some time later, my nearest neighbours received from a person worthy of faith certain information by which it is apparent that the priest named in the first place is absolutely unworthy of the episcopate on account of certain grave faults in his sacerdotal character. In consequence, Dr. Kenrick of Philadelphia has suggested to me the advisability of holding back the brief of his appointment in case the same should be sent to him through my hands. You will render me a great service if you will communicate this unpleasant fact to Cardinal Fransoni. The other two priests in Dr. England's list are not in my opinion of fit capacity for the episcopate.[11]

Before this letter had reached St. Louis, Dr. Rosati had written to the Secretary of Propaganda, Monsignor Cadolini, urging the immediate appointment of a successor to the Charleston See. Of the three priests mentioned in Dr. England's list, Bishop Rosati admitted he knew nothing. He had met Father Baker in one of the Provincial Councils, and remembered that Dr. England had told him that Baker was worthy to be raised to the episcopate. Father Baker had been a pupil of the Bishop of Charleston, had spent his entire priestly life with the Bishop in Charleston, and was therefore well known to Dr. England, in whose judgment Dr. Rosati had complete confidence. Moreover, he reminded the Secretary that it would be a hard thing to secure a bishop to take Dr. England's place, since the late bishop had so completely won the people of the Southland that many eligible priests would hesitate to go to Charleston as bishop of that See.

Propaganda received the official protest against Baker's appointment from Bishop Kenrick of Philadelphia (dated June 14, 1842) late in July. Kenrick had obtained his information from a priest in New York City, Father Andrew Byrne, who had been ordained

[11]Prop. Arch., *Scritt. rifer., Amer. Cent.*, vol. 13.

by Dr. England for the Diocese of Charleston, but had quitted that diocese because of an altercation with Father Baker. The charges made against Father Baker by Byrne (who was himself elected to the new See of Little Rock the following year) were the most serious that could be made; and it availed Father Baker nothing when, a year later (March 28, 1843), Kenrick wrote to Paul Cullen to say that a grave injustice had been done to the Charleston priest. The Holy See, and especially the Sacred Congregation, had always the highest esteem for Kenrick, and implicitly followed the hints and suggestions, and sometimes the innuendoes, which abound in his correspondence with Rome.[12]

The vacancy of almost two years which followed Dr. England's death was a veritable *coup de grâce* to his unsuccessful effort of over twenty years to arouse the Catholics of his diocese from a lethargy which his optimistic Irish temperament was never able to comprehend. His diocese was known to be the poorest in the American Church, and after his death rumors quickly spread that it was facing bankruptcy.

In his *Catholicity in the Carolinas and Georgia*, the Rev. Dr. J. J. O'Connell, O.S.B., himself a contemporary of the events of which he writes, says:

> The position was regarded as one of peculiar difficulty, because of the poverty of the diocese, the intolerance of the natives, the institution of slavery, and the eminence of the first Bishop, whose exceptional greatness the entire community would naturally expect to find in his successor. It was understood that the position was offered to Dr. O'Connor, the first Bishop of Pittsburgh, and that in his humility he declined the honor and the labor. Clergymen worthy to fulfil the office were unwilling to accept. For these and other considerations, the see remained vacant for two long years, and the machinery of administration was at a standstill, until it seemed doubtful whether the succession would be continued. Truly, those were difficult and trying times on the clergy of the long-widowed

---

[12]It was while the Sacred Congregation was considering the question of Father Baker's promotion that the news came from Rome of Dr. Michael O'Connor's appointment to Charleston. Dr. O'Connor had been Cullen's Vice-President at the Irish College, and was then pastor of St. Paul's Church in Pittsburgh. He knew from official sources that he was soon to be named to the new See of Pittsburgh, and was much incensed with those who were responsible for the rumor of his elevation to Charleston.

see. There were among the local clergy men capable of discharging the duties and maintaining the dignity of the episcopate, and who were subsequently decorated with the honor; but they were scarcely known outside the limits of the three States.

After barring the three candidates proposed by Bishop England, Archbishop Eccleston and his suffragans waited for the next Council, the Fifth Provincial of Baltimore, to meet (May 13-21, 1843) in order to consider the vacant See of Charleston. Besides Charleston, the Council considered candidates for the coadjutorship of New York and Boston, and for the new Sees to be erected at Pittsburgh, Little Rock, Chicago, Hartford, Milwaukee, and Oregon. The result of the balloting on Charleston resulted in a *terna* consisting of Rev. Ignatius A. Reynolds, then professor of theology in the Bardstown Seminary and Vicar-General of that diocese; Rev. Charles I. White, then a parish priest in Baltimore and one of the outstanding literary figures in the American priesthood; and the Rev. John Barry, then Vicar-General for the State of Georgia, and later (1857) consecrated as second Bishop of Savannah.

On December 15, 1843, Ignatius Reynolds was chosen by the Holy See for the vacant See of Charleston. For some time, he debated the prudence of accepting the charge, since he was convinced that the financial status of the diocese was beyond repair. Dr. Kenrick, who kept abreast of all the current news, wrote to Paul Cullen on January 1, 1844: "It is stated that Dr. Reynolds has determined on refusing the mitre. This will leave the wound gaping. It would not be right to urge him, although I think he would have done well to accept. I am not altogether certain of his having refused."

He accepted finally, and was consecrated in the Cathedral of Cincinnati by Archbishop Purcell, assisted by Bishops Miles and O'Connor, on March 19, 1844, and took possession of his See the following April.

Bishop Reynolds inaugurated a policy of strict retrenchment, which carried, however, an unfortunate aspect of criticism upon his predecessor's plans and methods. The Bardstown ecclesiastical atmosphere was not a favorable one in which to train the immediate successor of John England. It is evident from contemporary letters that Dr. England's friends considered the expulsion of the Ursulines

from the diocese and the temporary closing of the Philosophical and Classical Seminary unnecessary economic precautions.

Bishop Reynolds left for Europe in the spring of 1845, returning to Charleston on November 18 of that year. He convened the clergy to meet in annual retreat on December 10. The English-speaking world was then agog with the news of Newman's conversion, and Dr. Reynolds was able to bring to his clergy first-hand information of the movement towards the Church which was to follow under Newman's leadership. Three important announcements were made in the Clergy Retreat. The first was that Dr. England's Constitution might be observed by all those congregations of the diocese which had formerly accepted it, but that it was not binding on any churches or congregations. In fact, Dr. Reynolds stated that so many inconveniences attended the adoption of the Constitution that he believed Bishop England would have been induced in time "to modify or abandon entirely that system of Diocesan regulations." This was interpreted to mean that Bishop Reynolds was not in sympathy with the Constitution, and from this time it ceased to function. The second of these announcements was his intention "to prepare and publish the writings of his illustrious predecessor", and the appointment of the Rev. P. N. Lynch, D.D., as general editor of Dr. England's *Works*. The third announcement, concerning the financial condition of the diocese, resulted in a letter to the clergy, dated January 15, 1846.

It is this letter which may fittingly be described as the final page of Bishop England's episcopate. The letter was made public in the *Miscellany* for January 17, 1846, and several of its paragraphs aroused considerable resentment among Dr. England's friends:

> The difficulties with which my lamented Predecessor had to contend are known and appreciated by few, perhaps adequately by none, not even his most devoted friends and warmest admirers. Of his administration no one can form a correct judgment; for the motives, and perhaps, uncontrollable causes of much that he did, his anticipations and ultimate intentions, were known only to himself. God, in his mysterious Providence, called him to rest from his labours and receive the reward of his zeal, without requiring the sorrows, toils, disappointments and embarrassments, which his successor so deeply feels, and which he too, notwithstanding his splendid

talents and great energy of mind, would have experienced, had heaven left him still in the field of labour and of trial. He died, at the hour, truly least expected by others, and even by himself; and at the very time, when the resources of his powerful mind, and his extended fame and influence seemed most necessary to devise and apply the means of paying the heavy debts he had contracted, and for accomplishing the designs and undertakings of his zeal. He left a debt of thirty-four thousand dollars, and annual pensions, most justly due, to the amount of $650; $250 in the Bank, and the same sum in the hands of his grief-stricken Vicar-General and Administrator of the Diocess. To meet the above liabilities the proceeds of all the property he had owned, and all the donations received from Europe were by far insufficient. His successor, upon arriving in this Diocess, found about $14,000 of debts unpaid, besides the annuities above mentioned, without property, without income from any source; without means of support for himself and for the few clerical students,—other than the voluntary contributions of the Catholics of the Diocess, few in number, poor in worldly goods, and scattered over a territory of 163,000 square miles.

Bishop Reynolds estimated his flock as about 12,000, in a total population of 2,000,000:

> Of the Catholics, very few are wealthy, and of these few, some, alas! are only nominal members of our Church.
>
> In Charleston and Charleston Neck, there are not Catholics enough to form one numerous congregation; and yet, circumstances beyond the control, most probably, of my Predecessor, induced the erection of three churches, two in the City, and one on Charleston Neck, thus dividing and thereby diminishing the means of maintaining these churches and their respective pastors. The present Cathedral, sinking into decay beyond the possibility of repair, has only sixty pews, and of these, six or seven are generally not rented. The house occupied as a Seminary is actually falling into ruins, and is not only uncomfortable, but unhealthy and unsafe. The present Cathedral, Seminary, house of the Bishop, and lot on which these buildings stand, were, a few days since, valued by gentlemen entirely disinterested, and of much experience and long residence here, at nine thousand dollars. This valuation I requested to be made to obviate, if possible, the erroneous statements regarding the property, and from sources we should have little expected, making it worth $150,000!

From this time forward the *Miscellany*, even under the editorship

of Dr. Lynch, whom Bishop England had sent as his first student to Rome, ceased to mention his name. One by one during Bishop Reynold's administration his projects were abandoned, and the unity of spirit he had given to the Church in the three States constituting the Diocese of Charleston began quickly to wane.

Silence fell upon the long years of his episcopate. There were few to do him honor; none, in fact, to write the story of his life.

Interest was revived for a moment when the five volumes of his *Works* appeared, seven years after his death; but this belated tribute failed to recapture England's fame as one of the greatest pioneers in the American Church.

From the viewpoint of the defense of Catholic doctrine, it is regrettable that a writer of such vigor as Dr. England was not more advantageously placed in the American Church. He had grown to love Charleston and the Southland, and the uniform courtesy with which he was treated by non-Catholic citizens wherever he went in the pursuit of his duties as bishop had endeared the Southerners to his kindly, expansive heart. But he was never deceived over the amount of progress the Catholic Faith might make in the three States under his spiritual jurisdiction. In one way, he was thankful that the economic situation lessened the possibility of immigration into the South, for it took all his own energy and that of his devoted priests to keep the *pusillus grex* of Charleston alive to the duties and responsibilities of the Faith. With never at any time more Catholics under his pastoral care than would be considered a large parish today, it was fairly impossible to have done more than he did, owing to the scattered condition of the flock. His writings were his only means of accomplishing the good he believed his talents justified; but even these were hidden in the files of the *Miscellany,* and were naturally not given publicity in Catholic newspapers in other parts of the vast province of Baltimore, where the official attitude was on guard against one so intellectually able to lead in all national Church affairs. Had he been in one of the larger cities, or better still, had he succeeded Maréchal or Whitfield in the Metropolitan See of Baltimore, his splendidly equipped mind, his incisive, trenchant pen, and his peerless ability as a public speaker might have prevented much of the animosity towards a Church of which he was then the honor and the pride.

APPENDIX

Essay on the Sources

The general reader will hardly be interested in a detailed catalogue of the materials used in the composition of this work. The author owes it, however, to the writers who may follow him in the field of American Catholic history to point out the principal sources consulted and the archival research involved in his description of Dr. England's episcopate (1820-1842). Ecclesiastical history never stays written, either because each generation asks for a restatement of the past in terms of its own conditions, or because the constant discovery of fresh material brings new viewpoints and new problems.

In the present incomplete state of our knowledge of archival material at home and abroad, it would be hazardous for any student of American Catholic history to suggest to his readers that his interpretation of any single problem must be accepted as definitive and lasting. For this reason, it is well to give an accurate though not necessarily a complete statement of the printed and unprinted materials woven into this biography.

For many years to come, historians of the Catholic Church in the United States must content themselves with a biographical presentation of its past. The retrospect from the present day back to the consecration of our first bishop in 1790 scarcely permits any other treatment. This does not mean that such an approach should be acknowledged as the norm for the historical explanation of the one hundred and forty years of our established hierarchical life in this country. It means that, owing to the scattered and unorganized condition of our archival sources, the more prudent method is to center around the great figures in our Church the story of their times; with the hope that, as the years pass, our documentary knowledge will be increased and the institutional factors of our Catholic life become more salient and tangible.

John England is undoubtedly one of these great personalities. Owing to the peculiar conditions prevailing at the time both within and without the Church, everything he did and practically all that he wrote assumed national importance. The story of his life and times, therefore, may well be taken as the history of the Church in the United States during the twenty-two years he presided over the See of Charleston. Possessing a range of vision as broad as the land itself. nothing important of a bibliographical kind should be omitted in the life of one who was acknowledged to be the foremost Catholic churchman of his day.

1. Bibliographical Aids

There is no need, however, of repeating here the earlier notes of such a bibliographical study; namely, the critical essay on the source-material used in the *Life and Times of John Carroll* (pp. 832-856). All the printed books referred to in that essay were of service in this work. Nor is there any need

of listing all the secondary works on American political, social, and economic history which were consulted for its composition. The student will find the principal authorities cited in the foot-notes to the text. The bibliographies appended to the chapters in Winsor's *Narrative and Critical History of America* may be supplemented with the *Guide to the Study and Reading of American History*, by Professors Channing, Hart and Turner, although this volume studiously avoids any reference to the history of Catholicism in the United States. Grace Gardner Griffin's *Writings on American History* is an annual volume in which care is taken to include all important publications relating to American Catholic history. The *Catholic Historical Review* and the *American Historical Review* chronicle every three months articles and books on the same subject. The fifth and sixth volumes of McMaster's *History of the People of the United States* are of value for an insight into the social and economic conditions surrounding Catholic life in the period under study; and Channing's *History of the United States* is especially good for its interpretation of the earlier political movements in American history. Three recent publications will be found particularly helpful: Paxson's *History of the American Frontier* (Boston, 1924); Hockett's *Political and Social History of the United States to 1828* (New York, 1925), and Schlesinger's *Political and Social History of the United States, 1829-1925* (New York, 1925). The carefully balanced bibliographies in Hockett and Schlesinger are indispensable to the student. Finotti's *Bibliographia Catholica Americana* (New York, 1872), while listing printed works to 1820 only, contains many helps for later years.

2. Biographical Sources

Two brief biographical essays on the life and works of John England appeared shortly after his death. One of these was published in the Dublin *Complete Catholic Directory* for 1843 (pp. 251-262). This was reprinted in the Baltimore *Metropolitan Catholic Almanac* for 1844 (pp. 39-51). The other is by William George Read, in the *Religious Cabinet* (Baltimore, July, 1842), and is reprinted in the Catholic *Miscellany* for July 9, 1842 (vol. XXII, no. 1). This is the *Memoir of Bishop England* published in his *Works* (Reynolds edition), vol. I, pp. 4-20. The biographical sketch in Clarke's *Lives of the Deceased Bishops* (Vol. I, pp. 272-309. New York, 1872) is based on Read's *Memoir* with additions from the *Catholic Miscellany*. Up to the present these are the only biographies of Dr. England. In the Charleston Diocesan Archives, there is a manuscript sketch of England's life by Bishop Patrick N. Lynch, who occupied the See from 1858 to 1882. Although taught as a boy in the Charleston Seminary by Dr. England, and the object of his special guidance, Dr. Lynch adds nothing of value to Read's *Memoir*. Father Thomas England, P.P. of Passage, was the author of some excellent biographies: *Life of Abbé Edgeworth*, *Life of Bishop Moylan of Cork*, and *Life of Father O'Leary*, the celebrated Franciscan of Cork. Thomas England survived his illustrious brother five years, and it was natural to expect that he might have begun a biography based on family papers and traditions. Every possible clue to

such a manuscript was sought for the writer by the present Bishop of Cork, the Most Revd. Daniel Cohalan, D.D., and by his brother, Rev. Jeremiah Cohalan, P.P., of Bandon, but without success. There are no descendants of the England family in Cork at the present time.

The published biographies of the bishops who were Dr. England's contemporaries in the American episcopate furnished collateral documents and traditions. Among these may be cited: Du Bourg, *Life of Cardinal de Cheverus, 1768-1836*, translated by Robert Walsh (Philadelphia, 1839); Spalding, *Life of Bishop Flaget, 1763-1850* (Louisville, 1852); Fox, *Life of Bishop David, 1761-1841* (New York, 1925); Griffin, *Life of Bishop Conwell, 1745-1842*, in the *Researches*, vols. III-XXVIII (*passim*); Souvay, *Rosati, 1789-1843*, in the *Cath. Hist. Review*, vol. III, pp. 3-21, 165-187; O'Daniel, *Life of Bishop Fenwick, O.P., 1768-1832* (Washington, D. C., 1920); Bruté de Remur, *Life of Bishop Bruté, 1779-1839* (Paris, 1887); Bayley, *Memoirs of Bishop Bruté*, (New York, 1876); De Cailly, *Life of Bishop Loras, 1792-1858* (New York, 1897); Hassard, *Life of Archbishop Hughes, 1797-1864* (New York, 1866); O'Daniel, *Life of Bishop Miles, O. P., 1791-1860* (Washington, D. C., 1926); O'Shea, *The Two Kenricks* (Francis Patrick, 1796-1863, and Peter Richard, 1806-1896) (Philadelphia, 1904); and De Rivière, *Life of Bishop de Forbin-Janson, 1785-1844* (Paris, 1892). Short accounts of the other contemporary bishops (Connolly, Du Bourg, Maréchal, Kelly, Fenwick, S.J., Dubois, Portier, Whitfield, De Neckere, Rese, Eccleston, Chabrat, Hailandière, Chanche, Diego y Moreno, Lefebvre, and O'Connor) will be found in O'Donnell's *Catholic Hierarchy of the United States* (Washington, D. C., 1922).

3. Special Works

Apart from Shea's *History of the Catholic Church in the United States*, the third volume of which covers the years 1808 to 1843, and O'Gorman's *History of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States*, the only source for the events of Bishop England's episcopate is O'Connell's *Catholicity in the Carolinas and Georgia* (New York, 1879). Unfortunately O'Connell is not a trustworthy recorder of the facts. Although he spent nearly forty years amid the scenes he describes, he blunders at critical moments when an accurate chronicle of the traditions is most needed. "I claim a margin for slight errors of dates", he says, "and I have omitted facts and suppressed names." Shea gives Dr. England less than forty of the seven hundred pages of his third volume, though confessing that "Bishop England was one of the most remarkable men in the history of the Church in America... here and at Rome, he acquired an influence which could not be accorded to one not really great." None of the political or social histories of the Carolinas or Georgia gives more than a passing reference to Dr. England. Neither McCrady in his four volumes of the history of South Carolina, nor Ramsay in his history of the State, comes down later than the year 1808. Carroll's *Historical Collections of South Carolina* (2 vols., New York, 1836) stops with American Independence. Simm's *History of South Carolina* (Charleston, 1840) is of little service for the

Catholic history of that State. Mrs. Ravenel's *Charleston* (New York, 1906) was found serviceable for resetting in the imagination the Charleston Dr. England knew. Ashe's *History of North Carolina* (Greensboro, 1908), Jones' *History of Georgia* (2 vols., Boston, 1883), and Stevens' *History of Georgia* (2 vols., Philadelphia, 1819) were equally unsatisfactory in tracing the rise and progress of Catholicism in these States. Cobb's *Rise of Religious Liberty in America* is weak in its treatment of the forces making for and against toleration in the South. Hunt's *Life in America One Hundred Years Ago* (New York, 1914) helps to a limited extent in visualizing the social conditions in America about the time of Dr. England's arrival. Robinson's *Evolution of American Political Parties* (New York, 1924) is valuable for the anti-Catholic political movements of the pre-Civil War period. The *History of the Social Life of the Southern States* (Richmond, Virginia, 1902) was found of little use for our purpose.

In the special field of church history some few sources are worthy of mention. The first of these is Dr. England's *History of the Diocese of Charleston*, written in 1832 (*Works*, Messmer edition, vol. IV, pp. 298-327). This is of value only for the years 1820-1832. The principal diocesan histories consulted for collateral assistance within the period 1820-1842 are: Kirlin, *Catholicity in Philadelphia* (1909); Smith, *The History of the Catholic Church in New York* (2 vols., 1905); Webb, *Centenary of Catholicity in Kentucky* (1884); the *Catholic History of Alabama and the Floridas* (New York, 1908); and Lamott. *History of the Archdiocese of Cincinnati* (1920). Of parochial histories only one is worthy of mention: Hopkins' *Historic Sketch of St. Mary's Church, Charleston* (1899), written from its own well-preserved archives. A series of articles, remarkable for their research, was published by Rev. Joseph D. Mitchell, in the Catholic Laymen's *Bulletin*, of Augusta, Georgia, during 1920-1924. The history of the Ursulines, as written in this work, is based upon a manuscript loaned for the purpose by the present community of Columbia, South Carolina, and upon the *Ursuline Nuns in America*, by Vogel in the *Records* (ACHS), vol. I, pp. 214-255. The story of the Charleston Sisters of Mercy is given in the *Records*, vol. XV (*A Southern Teaching Order*), and in Shea's translation of the *Life of Saint Angela Merici* (Philadelphia, 1857). The facts regarding Madame Héry du Jarday were copied for me by the Superioress of the Convent of the Dames de la Retraite at Angers, France. The history of the educational work of these communities was supplemented by Meriwether's *History of Higher Education in South Carolina*, Brown's *The Making of Our Middle Schools*, and Burns' *Catholic School System in the United States*, which brings the story of the origin and progress of Catholic education to 1840. A valuable source-book for the problem of immigration, which recently appeared—Abbott, *Historical Aspects of the Immigration Problem: Select Documents* (Chicago, 1926)—was helpful in dealing with the "Foreign Conspiracy" of the years 1830-40.

4. Printed Sources

As the reader will have noticed, one of the most valuable sources for this work is the correspondence referred to as the Irish College *Portfolio*. A copy of all the letters from the American bishops to Paul (Cardinal) Cullen, to Dr. O'Connor, later Bishop of Pittsburgh, and to other officials of the Irish College in Rome, was made some years ago by Father Kittell of Loretto, Pennsylvania, for the American Catholic Historical Society. Portions of this correspondence were published in the *Records* [cited throughout as *Records* (ACHS)]. Through the courtesy of the Society the entire manuscript was loaned to me and I have included all that was cognate to the subject in these volumes. The archives of the Society also furnished me with valuable letters on the Philadelphia schism. The main source for printed documents of the Sacred Congregation de Propaganda Fide is De Martinis, *Jus Pontificium de P. F.*, in eight volumes (Rome, 1892). Hernaez (*Coleccion de Bulas, Breves y otros Documentos relativos a la Iglesia de America y Filipinas*, 2 vols., Brussels, 1877) gives nothing that is not in the *Bullarium Romanum* and the old *Bullarium de P. Fide*. The Bull for the erection of the See of Charleston is not in these printed collections. The *Researches* and the *Records* of the American Catholic Historical Society are a mine for the student. The same may be said of the *Historical Records and Studies* of the United States Catholic Historical Society (346 Convent Avenue, New York City), the *St. Louis Catholic Historical Review*, the *Acta et Dicta* of the St. Paul Catholic Historical Society, and the *Illinois Catholic Historical Review* (28 North Franklin Street, Chicago, Illinois). Moran's *Spicilegium Ossoriense* (3 vols., Dublin, 1884) is not altogether trustworthy even in the documents relating to the American Church. The *Concilia habita Baltimori ab anno 1829 ad annum 1849* is an official reprint of all the *acta et decreta* of the Councils of Baltimore up to 1849. My *National Pastorals of the American Hierarchy* (Washington, D. C., 1923) contains the Pastoral Letters from 1791 to 1919. Another series of printed documents will be found in the *Journal of the American Irish Historical Society*. One of the valuable collections used in this work was the correspondence of Bishop England in the rather scarce *Seven Hills Magazine* (Dublin), volumes II and III, a copy of which was given me by Bishop Cohalan of Cork. The England-Gaston correspondence is published in the *Records* (ACHS), volumes XVIII, XIX and XX. The *United States Catholic Historical Magazine*, which was issued quarterly from 1888 to 1892, contains a number of documents not found elsewhere. Among the most helpful of all source-publications were the documents and commentaries in *State Policy in Irish Education (1536-1810)*, by Rev. T. J. Corcoran, S.J. (Dublin, 1916). The *Annales* of the Society for the Propagation of the Faith (Lyons) and the *Berichte* of the Leopoldine Association of Vienna are among the most valuable printed collections we possess for American Catholic history.

5. Manuscript Sources

1. *Rome.* The principal archival depot for American Catholic history from

1622 to 1908 is the manuscript collection of the Sacred Congregation de Propaganda Fide, housed in the Collegio Urbano, Rome. This collection has been catalogued in a general way by Fish, *Guide to the Materials for American History in Roman and other Italian Archives* (Washington, D. C., 1911). With the help of the former archivist, Monsignor Castellucci, and his assistant, Signor Roberto Caroli, transcripts (mostly in photostat copies) were made of all documents concerning Dr. England's episcopate. The chief divisions of these archives referred to in the text are the *Scritture riferite, Scritture originali, Udienze, Lettere* and *Atti.* An explanation of these will be found in Fish (*op. cit.*, pp. 119-123), and in my *Sacred Congregation de Propaganda Fide* in the *Catholic Historical Review*, vol. VI, pp. 478-494. The archives of the Irish College have already been mentioned. The *Portfolio* is an integral part of our Catholic history, as are also the papers and letters of Dr. Gradwell, now in the archives of the English College at Rome.

2. *Dublin.* The manuscript collections of the National Library were closed by the Free State Government in the summer of 1923, but permission was given to the writer to work in the Library. Neither here nor in the quaint Marsh Library were any documents of value found. The National Library contains some copies of the *Cork Mercantile Chronicle*, but not for the years when Dr. England was editor or proprietor. In the archives of the Franciscan Convent, Merchant's Quay, I was fortunate in having the aid of Father Gregory Cleary, O.F.M., in my search for material on the life and doings of Father Richard Hayes, O.F.M. Father John Condon, O.S.A., of the Augustinian Priory, John Street, assisted me in making further researches for the earlier period of Father Robert Browne's career. The archives of the Presentation Convent, George's Hill, were examined for data on Thaddeus O'Meally of Philadelphia Schism fame. The Rev. Michael H. McInerny, O.P., of St. Savior's Priory, Dominick Street, accompanied me to Tallaght, where the principal Irish Dominican Archives are housed. Only one letter from the pen of John England was found, but some sixty letters of vital importance to American Catholic history were discovered and were copied by the Dominican Fathers for this work. It was in these archives that Father Harold's remarkable history of the Church here (to 1819), which is used in the Introduction to this work, was found. Naturally, it was to be expected that considerable material would be found in the Archiepiscopal Archives of Dublin. His Grace permitted me to make a thorough search of the Troy papers and of the other archival collections, but very little of importance for the problem of the relations between Archbishop Troy (1786-1823) and the American hierarchy was discovered. In this respect, however, it seems but fair to add that the greater portion of these archives was taken to Sydney, Australia, in 1884 by Archbishop (Cardinal) Moran for the purpose of writing a biography of Cardinal Cullen.

3. *Carlow.* No documents going back to England's days as a student at Carlow (1803-1808) were found. There is a fine portrait of Bishop England in the college parlor. The Very Rev. Dr. John Foley, President of the College, gave me all the traditions which had survived about John England. The late

Bishop Patrick Foley of Kildare and Leighlin, and Bishop Codd of Wexford, were visiting the College at the time, and from the former I received several traditions throwing light on obscure spots in the documentary evidence collected up to that time. Bishop Codd sent me later a photograph of the Hayes portrait in the Franciscan Convent of Wexford.

4. Nothing of value was found in Kilkenny, where Dr. Kelly, first Bishop of Richmond lived, nor in Waterford, where he died as Bishop. There is only one letter of Dr. Kelly's episcopate in Waterford (1822-1829) in these archives. Through Canon Byrne, the President of St. John's College, Waterford, I secured a second copy of that scarce publication, the *Seven Hills Magazine*, which contains the England-Cullen letters.

5. Rev. Jeremiah Canon Cohalan, P.P., of Bandon gave considerable time and interest to the search for living traditions in that city of Dr. England's pastorate.

6. *Cork.* Bishop Cohalan instituted a search in many parts of his diocese for data regarding John England, and in this way contributed to the earlier chapters of this work all they contain on England's life as a priest in Cork. The *Annals* of the Presentation Convent were found to contain many references to Bishop England, especially during the years his sister was Superioress. They were copied by the nuns for this work. No letters between Dr. England and his sister are in the convent archives.

7. *France.* During the summer of 1923 a personal search was made in the archiepiscopal archives of Bordeaux and Besançon and in the diocesan archives of Montauban, for the purpose of finding any letters which might have passed between Cardinal de Cheverus and Archbishop Du Bourg and their former colleagues in the American hierarchy. Nothing was found except the correspondence of Madame Hery du Jarday from Charleston with Cardinal de Cheverus. No documents for Dr. England's episcopate were to be found in the archives of the Congregation of the Mission (cf. *Répertoire Historique et Table Générale des Annales de la Congregation de la Mission.* Paris, 1900). The Sulpician archives could not be seen. Father Boyle of the Irish College of Paris searched in the archives there for letters between Dr. England and its officers and professors, but nothing important was found. I had the use of all the notes taken in the Archives of the Society of the Propagation of the Faith (both in Lyons and Paris) made by Dr. Hickey during his year's study in these collections.

8. *Quebec.* The archives of the archbishop's house contain several unimportant letters from Dr. England, but are rich in documentary material for the history of the Catholic Church in the United States from Carroll's day down to the middle of the last century.

9. *Baltimore.* After the Propaganda Archives, the principal center for documentary sources is the Baltimore Cathedral Archives (cited throughout as BCA). The cases consulted were: *Administration of Neale* (Cases 12, 12A); *Letters to Maréchal* (Cases 13A, 13B, 14C, 15C, 15D, 16D-E-F, 17G-H-I-K,

18L-M, 19M-N-O-P, 20Q-R-S-T, 21V-W-Y-Z, 21A Supplement); *Administration of Maréchal* (Cases 22, 22A, 22B, 32C); *Administration of Whitfield* (Cases 23, 23A); and *Administration of Eccleston* (Cases 24A-G, 25G-R, 26S-Z, 27, 27A). Through the generosity of Archbishop Curley, I was enabled to secure the services of several assistants who made transcripts of all the letters and papers referring to Bishop England. This more than anything else made it possible to complete the work in so short a time as five years.

10. *Charleston.* When I began my researches in Charleston in the summer of 1922, the diocesan archives contained scarcely a dozen documents relating to Bishop England's episcopate. Fortunately, one of the priests of the diocese remembered that some documents had been walled up in a little alcove in the library of the Bishop's house, and, when the boards were taken down, seven large tin boxes of letters and papers were uncovered. About half of these belonged to Dr. England's day. There are large batches of letters of Father Wallace's correspondence with mathematicians throughout the United States and England, many papers of an official character relating to diocesan affairs, and considerable material of a domestic nature such as financial accounts of parishes, wills, legacies, etc. Very little of this was of value for my work, but a thorough study of these documents gave me a better insight into Dr. England's plans and projects and into the ecclesiastical personnel of his time. Since then, these documents have been catalogued and are housed in the episcopal residence. The *Private Journal* of Bishop Reynolds, now in these Archives, does not shed any light on the policy Dr. England's successor pursued at the outset of his episcopate.

11. The Catholic Archives of America (*University of Notre Dame*) is the most extensive single depot of documentary material for American Catholic history in the United States. Unfortunately, these manuscript materials are not completely catalogued so that it is impossible to state what letters for the period treated in this work have not been seen.

12. The archives at Georgetown University did not yield any documents of value for my period. The Rev. P. J. Cormican, S.J., former Archivist, assisted me in locating rare and scarce pamphlet material for this work.

6. Newspapers and Periodicals

For the years of Dr. England's episcopate there are, according to Middleton's list in the *Records* (ACHS), vol. IV, pp. 213-242, and XIX, pp. 19-41, almost forty Catholic newspapers and periodicals, published in all parts of the United States. As a general rule, it was found in comparing these that the items concerning the Diocese of Charleston were merely extracts from the *United States Catholic Miscellany*, which has been made the subject of a separate chapter in his work. When I went to Charleston in 1922 to begin researches in that city and district, no complete set of the *Miscellany* was available. There was a broken set of twenty-two volumes in the library of the Convent of the Sisters of Mercy. Several odd volumes of the quarto edition (volumes II-V) were in the possession of Rev. Bernard W. Fleming on Sul-

livan's Island, and these were loaned to me. These did not, however, fill out the series for the years 1822-1842. The only complete set (up to 1842) had been loaned by the late Bishop Northrop to the Rev. Thomas L. Kelly, LL.D., of Warren, Rhode Island, and through the kindness of Father Kelly and of the Rev. James J. May, then Chancellor of the diocese, these volumes were sent to me. An advertisement in the Charleston *News and Courier* (August 6, 1922) brought me other stray volumes. The *Miscellany*, more so than many of the contemporary Catholic journals, was an official paper and as such has more than secondary value as an historical source for Dr. England's life. One volume of the *Metropolitan* (Baltimore) was published in 1830, one volume of the *Religious Cabinet* (Baltimore) was published in 1842, and five volumes of its successor, the *United States Catholic Magazine* (1843-1847), were issued. These are replete with valuable information. Through the courtesy of the South Carolina Historical Society (Charleston) all the old dailies and weeklies of that city were examined, and many items of interest were found in the *Courier*. The Georgia Historical Society (Savannah) placed the *Georgian* at my disposal, and it was found to contain many more notices of Catholic activities than its sister journal of Charleston.

Parallel with all these references to the source-material used in this work should go a number of collateral volumes dealing with the political history of the United States, of Ireland, England, and the West Indies, and of the Southern States in particular. But the indications given in the section entitled BIBLIOGRAPHICAL AIDS, are sufficient.

THE END

INDEX

Abolition Movement, ii, 295.
Abridgement of the Christian Doctrine (Challoner), i, 314.
Abriss der Geschichte von Cincinnati, ii, 185.
Academy for Young Ladies (Charleston), ii, 35, 136, 171.
Act of Emancipation, i, 98; ii, 194.
Act of Toleration of 1793 (Ireland), i, 60.
Act of Union (Ireland), i, 105.
Acta et Decreta (Prov. Councils), ii, 265, 269, 513.
Acta et Dicta (St. Paul Cath. Hist. Soc.), ii, 559.
Adams, John Quincy, i, 328; ii, 48.
Address before Congress (England), ii, 48-67.
Address on American Citizenship (England), ii, 418.
Adrian VI, Pope, i, 556.
"Aggregate Meeting" (1815), i, 262.
Alabama, Church in, i, 572.
Alien and Sedition Laws, ii, 6.
Allen, Cardinal, i, 480.
Altamirano, Bishop, i, 556.
Amelia Island, i, 156, 573.
America and Ireland, ii, 1-6.
America, Irish in, ii, 4.
American Catholic Historical Society (Phila.) *Records*, ii, 559.
American Historical Review, ii, 556.
American hierarchy (1827), i, 449-450.
American political ideals and Catholicism, ii, 41.
American Protestant Association, ii, 221.
American Sees, nominations to, i, 442.
Americanization, ii, 71.
Ami de la Religion, ii, 171.
Annalen der Verbreitung des Glaubens, ii, 183.
Annales (Propagation of the Faith), i, 525; ii, 181, 247, 350, 357.
Annales de la Congregation de la Mission, ii, 561.
Annals (Presentation Nuns), i, 52, 76; ii, 171.
Annapolis, i, 20.
Antecedents to Council of 1829, ii, 68-110.
Anti-Catholicism in the U. S., ii, 194, 378, 392, 517.
Anti-Catholic agitation, ii, 404.
Anti-Catholic epithets, ii, 377, 454.
Anti-Catholic forces, ii, 504.
Anti-Catholic movement in the U. S., ii, 220, 228, 269, 405.
Anti-Catholic prejudice, ii, 377, 456.
Anti-Catholic spirit, ii, 90.
Anti-Duelling Association, ii, 17.
Anti-Federalists, ii, 423.
Anti-Slavery Society, ii, 151.
Anti-Vetoists, i, 110.
Antivetoistical Catechism (Hayes), i, 265.
Antonelli, Cardinal, i, 33, 60, 137, 141.
Antwerp, Irish College at, i, 60.
Apostasy, i, 19.
Apostolic Delegate (1818), i, 427.
Apostolic Delegate to Haiti, ii, 141, 270-313.
Apostolic Delegate to the U. S. (Plessis), ii, 48.
Appointments, to American Sees, ii, 245.
Archdiocese of St. Louis, ii, 514.
Archives, Baltimore, Bordeaux, Carlow, Charleston, Quebec, Notre Dame, Tallaght, ii, 559-562.
Archives, Diocese of Charleston, i, 311; ii, 317.
Ark and the *Dove*, i, 100.
Armada, i, 126.
Arundel, Lord, i, 126.
Ashley, John, i, 384.
Astoria (Wash. Irving), ii, 400.
Attacks on the Church, ii, 71.
Atti (Propaganda), ii, 250.
Atrocities of Governor Moore, i, 555.
Augusta, i, 4, 12, 156; ii, 167.
Australasian Catholic Record, ii, 293.
Austria, charity of, i, 534.
Avignon, ii, 358.
Awful Exposure (Maria Monk), ii, 35, 465.
Ayllon, i, 134.

"B. C.", ii, 66.
Baker, Rev. R. S., i, 471, 547; ii, 504, 534, 541, 548.
Ballot, obligation of, ii, 518.
Baltimore, Archives, i, 140; ii, 120; Diocese of, i, 7, 18, 20; general description of, ii, 73; Province of, ii, 73.

Bandon, i, 91, 101, 112, 121, 264; ii, 140.
Barbastro, Rev. Luis Cancer de, i, 553.
Bardstown, Diocese of, i, 4, 7, 13, 21; ii, 250, 511, 575.
Bardstown, translation to Louisville, ii, 511.
Barry, Bishop John, i, 543; ii, 167, 551.
Bayer, Rev. B., C.SS.R., ii, 388.
Breckinridge, Rev. Robert, ii, 421
Brief Account etc., ii, 189.
British Guiana, V. A. of, ii, 347.
Brotherhood of San Marino, ii, 160.
Browne, Rev. Robert, O. S. A., i, 12-14, 32, 156, 161, 214-231, 329-331; ii, 483.
Brownlee, Dr., i, 429; ii, 379.
Burke, Dr. Thomas, i, 131, 389.
Beecher, Dr. Lyman, i, 460, ii, 231, 421.
Benedict XIV, i, 82.
Betagh, Dr., i, 85.
Berichte (Leopoldine Association), ii, 188, 559.
Bermingham, Rev. John, i, 338; ii, 142, 278, 333.
Bible, Challoner's, i, 331, 332.
Bibliographia Catholica Americana (Finotti), ii, 223.
Biographies, episcopal, ii, 556.
Bishop, for the Germans (1836), ii, 383.
Bishop, of Cork, i, 104, 123; of Meath, i, 102; of New Orleans, i, 551; of Santiago de Cuba, i, 556; of Savannah, i, 551; of Waterford, i, 434.
"Bishopites," i, 390.
Blanc, Bishop Anthony, ii, 241, 248.
Bohemia, i, 208.
Boland, Rev. Francis, i, 575 ff.
Bolton and Ross (*The Debatable Land*), i, 553.
Borgia, Cardinal, i, 103.
Boyer, President, ii, 142, 272, 294, 330.
Boyle, Rev. Patrick, C. M., ii, 561.
Brenan (*Eccl. Hist. of Ireland*)), i, 61, 116.
Brent, Daniel, ii, 234.
Brownson, Dr., i, 367, 369; ii, 476, 502.
Bruté, Bishop, i, 123, 250, 260, 338; ii, 389, 574.
Butler, Bishop James, i, 70.
Burke, Rev. Wm., ii, 163.
Butler, Rev. T., ii, 390.
Byrne, Bishop Andrew, ii, 260, 549.
Byrne, Father Dominick, i, 542.
Bullarium (S. C. de P. F.), i, 563.

Cahensly, Peter Paul, ii, 353.
Calderon, Bishop, i, 557.
Calhoun, ii, 423.
Calvinist ministers, in Haiti, ii, 272.
Camps, Father Peter, i, 559.
Canevin, Archbishop, i, 8; ii, 353.
Cappellari, Cardinal, i, 514; ii, 131, 239.
Captivity, of Pius VII, ii, 70.
Capuchins, in Haiti, ii, 271.
Carbry, Father Thomas, O.P., i, 12, 32, 245, 272.
Cardinalate, Bp. England and, ii, 143, 293.
Carey, Mathew, i, 402; ii, 9, 453.
Carles, Abbé, i, 160.
Carlow College, i, 58, 108; ii, 140, 257, 315.
Carmelites, ii, 124, 395.
Carolinas, i, 25; Irish immigration to, ii, 4.
Carr, Rev. M., O. S. A., i, 192.
Carroll, Archbishop John, i, 1-34 *passim*, 159-161, 202, 212, 451; ii, 74, 121.
Carroll, Charles, of Carrollton, i, 518; ii, 60, 125, 140, 228.
Casanovas, Father, i, 559.
Castlereagh Papers, i, 64.
Castracane, Cardinal, ii, 247, 254.
Catalogue, of Bishop England's *Works*, ii, 415-417.
Catechism, Butler's, i, 314; Conwell's, ii, 98; Doway, i, 314.
Catechisme or a Christian Doctrine necessarie for Children and Ignorant People, i, 314.
Catechisms, i, 313-314.
Catholic Advocate, ii, 406.
Catholic Association, i, 123.
Catholic Bible, i, 35.
Catholic bookstores, ii, 223.
Catholic Church, and American political ideals, ii, 41, 57-58, 71.
Catholic education, ii, 133-172.
Catholic Emancipation, i, 35, 98, 105, 119, 122, 471; ii, 421.
Catholic Herald, ii, 257, 547.
Catholic Historical Review, ii, 356.
Catholic History of North America, (McGee), ii, 2.
Catholic institutions in the U. S. (1833), ii, 250-251; (1838), ii, 402.
Catholic newspapers, i, 462; ii, 218.

Catholic Periodical Library, ii, 466.
"Catholic Question in America," the, ii, 402.
Catholic Relief Bill (1793), i, 59, 100.
Catholic Truth Society (Balt.), ii, 495.
Catholic University, proposed for Washington, D. C. (1819), i, 288.
Catholicity in the Carolinas and Georgia (O'Connell), ii, 550.
Catholics, in Penna., ii, 365; New York, i, 430; Ireland, i, 101; number in U. S. (1818), i, 7; Maryland, i, 20; (1840), ii, 382, 517.
Ceremonial, ii, 123, 391.
Cerri, Urbano, i, 128.
Chabrat, Bishop, i, 578; ii, 242, 247.
Challoner, Bishop, i, 314.
Chanche, Bishop, ii, 260, 399, 510.
Chapter, Baltimore Cathedral, ii, 79.
Character of George Washington, ii, 35.
Charleston, i, 6-35; 209-226 *passim;* 380-399 *passim;* 432, 459, 552; ii, 98, 147, 409.
Charleston Archives, i, 541; ii, 137.
Charleston, Catholic educational institutions in (1835), ii, 147.
Charleston College, i, 484.
Charleston *Courier,* ii, 153, 545.
Charleston, Diocese of, i, 475; ii, 409.
Charleston fire (1838), i, 540.
Charleston, Literary and Philosophical Society of, ii, 16.
Charleston *Observer,* ii, 143.
Charleston Schism, i, 164-261.
Charleston Seminary, i, 475-517.
Charleston, Synod of, ii, 98.
Charlestown, Mass., i, 428; ii, 27.
Charter Schools, i, 48.
Chazelle, Rev. Peter, S. J., ii, 510.
Cheverus, Cardinal, i, 4, 11, 13, 29, 32, 150, 300, 344, 387, 396, 451; ii, 48, 69, 80, 391.
Chicago, Diocese of, ii, 551.
Choice Works of Bp. England (McElrone), ii, 412.
Cholera, ii, 223, 341.
Christian Instructed, Devout, i, 314.
Christian, Sincere (Hay), i, 314.
Christian, The Pious, i, 314.
Church, and State, ii, 49, 119, 427.
Church, Catholic, in the U. S. (1841), ii, 523.
Church in Florida, i, 551-569.
Church in Virginia (Guilday), i, 166.
Church progress (1834), ii, 267-268.
Cincinnati, Diocese of, i, 6, 518.
Clancy, Bishop, i, 538; ii, 294, 298, 314-351.
Classics, ii, 19-21; 37.
Clay, Henry, ii, 103, 233.
Cleary, Rev. Gregory, O.F.M., ii, 559.
Clergy, supply of, i, 8, 22-24; ii, 244.
Cloistral life, ii, 28.
Clorivière, Father, i, 37, 39, 153-156, 214, 223-226.
Cohalan, Bishop (Cork), i, 53, 71, 93, 99, 457; *Life of Bishop Moylan,* i, 54; ii, 557, 561.
Cohalan, Canon, i, 93; ii, 561.
Colleges, Catholic (1833), ii, 250-251.
Collegio Urbano, i, 536; ii, 175.
Colony, Asylum, i, 160.
Columbia College (S. C.), i, 311.
Cologne, Archbishop of, ii, 519.
Colonies, Church in Spanish, ii, 363.
Colored people, missions among, ii, 472.
Concanen, Bishop, i, 426, 451.
Concordat, Haitian, ii, 280.
Condon, Rev. John, O.S.A., ii, 560.
Condon, Peter, ii, 421.
Congress, Address before, ii, 48-67.
Congregation of the Holy Ghost, ii, 175.
Congregation of the Mission, ii, 124, 175.
Connolly, Bishop, i, 30-33, 90, 233, 300, 431, 435; ii, 75, 92.
Connor, R.D.W., i, 129.
Consalvi, Cardinal, i, 114-117, 263, 332, 572; ii, 88, 180.
Constitution of the Diocese of Charleston, i, 343-379; ii, 131, 338, 532.
Constitution of North Carolina, religious clause of, i, 129.
Controversies, ii, 51, 463.
Conventions, annual, of the Diocese of Charleston, i, 132, 513, 517, 540, 541; ii, 127, 148, 184, 209, 333, 480-501.
Converts, ii, 230.
Conwell, Bishop, i, 4, 9, 15, 32, 83, 90, 300, 314, 327, 381-395 *passim,* 422, 468, 492; ii, 48, 97, 98, 115, 121, 213, 235, 239, 497.
Cooper, Francis, ii, 523.
Cooper, Rev. Samuel, i, 162, 163, 307-308, 318, 327-329, 496.
Corcoran, Monsignor James A., i, 471, 536, 541, 543; ii, 1.
Corcoran, Rev. T. J., S.J., i, 43, 45, 84; ii, 142, 409, 559.
Cork Mercantile Chronicle, i, 112-120 *passim;* ii, 138.

Cork, Ursulines of, ii, 27.
Corkery, Father Denis, i, 299, 318, 329.
Coste, Benoît, ii, 177.
Coskery, Rev. Henry, ii, 511.
Council, First Provincial (1829), antecedents to, ii, 68-110; session, ii, 111-132.
Council, Second Provincial (1833), i, 534; ii, 192, 243-269.
Council, Third Provincial (1837), ii, 377-404.
Council, Fourth Provincial (1840), ii, 502-529.
Council of Trent, i, 479; ii, 243.
Counter-Reform, ii, 173.
Creyon, Colonel, i, 310, 311, 337.
Cronin, Rev. T. J., i, 167.
Crosby, Rev. Michael, i, 551, 581.
Cullen, Paul Cardinal, i, 429, 532, 536, 539; ii, 152, 261, 267, 315, 321, 339, 532.
Curtis, Archbishop, i, 32, 331, 332.

Dames de la Retraite, ii, 141, 320.
Damphoux, Rev. E., S.S., ii, 122, 260, 510.
Datty, Julia (Mother Benedicta), ii, 157.
Daughters of Charity, ii, 224.
David, Bishop, i, 34, 314, 361, 444, 476, 573; ii, 242, 247, 260.
Davilla, Father, i, 157.
Death, of Bishop England, ii, 541.
De Barth, Father, i, 380, 381; ii, 260.
Debatable Land (Bolton-Ross), i, 553.
Debate, Hughes-Breckinridge, ii, 378; Purcell-Campbell, ii, 468.
Decrees, Baltimore Provincial Councils, ii, 512.
De Forbin-Janson, Bishop, ii, 213, 488, 509, 531.
De Lacy, Father, i, 133.
De la Hailandière, Bishop, ii, 510.
Delahogue, Dr. Louis, i, 67.
Deluol, Rev. Louis, S. S., i, 489; ii, 122, 260, 385, 510.
Demerara, ii, 351.
De Neckere, Bishop, ii, 134, 218, 247, 275.
De Sedella, Fray Antonio, ii, 241.
Detroit, Diocese of, i, 578; ii, 386.
Devitt, Rev. E. J., S.J., i, 25.
Diocese, of Charleston, i, 283-298; organization of, 299, 342; Constitution of, 343-379.
Dioceses: Dubuque, ii, 402; Mobile, ii, 251; Nashville, ii, 402; Natchez, ii, 402; Richmond, ii, 115; Vincennes, ii, 250.
Diocesan archives (Charleston), i, 311.
Diocesan limits (1833), ii, 243, 250.
Diocesan Seminary, of Charleston, i, 474-516.
Diocesan Synod, of Charleston, ii, 98.
Diocesan Synod of 1791, ii, 121.
Directory, Laity's, i, 312.
Discipline, ecclesiastical, ii, 132.
Discourses, public, of Bp. England, ii, 1-57.
Dissensions, in American Church, i, 2.
Diurnal, England's, i, 40, 300, 308, 313, 329; ii, 7.
Documents relative to the Present Distressed State etc., i, 227.
Domestic Slavery, ii, 471.
Dominican Archives (Tallaght), ii, 107, 561.
Donaghey, John, i, 14, 211-212, 225, 258.
Donelan, Rev. James B., ii, 510.
"Double Allegiance," ii, 427.
Douay, version of Holy Scripture, ii, 126.
Doyle, Bishop ("J.K.L."), i, 55, 66, 94, 122; ii, 315.
Doyle, Rev. Henry, i, 336, 382, 397.
Dublin, i, 23, 110, 117, 521; archiepiscopal archives of, ii, 560.
Dubois, Bishop, i, 445-460, 518, 538; ii, 121, 131, 232, 260, 397.
Du Bourg, Bishop, i, 4, 5, 11, 160, 300, 573, 579, 583; ii, 73, 94, 391, 504.
Duel, Origin and History of, ii, 17.
Dunboyne, Lord, i, 78.
Dzierozynski, Rev. Francis, S.J., ii, 122.

Ecclesiastical discipline, ii, 132.
Ecclesiastical institutions, i, 548.
Ecclesiastical property rights, ii, 523.
Eccleston, Archbishop, i, 544; ii, 67, 111, 260, 269, 321, 343, 385, 504.
Education, i, 84; ii, 133-172.
Egan Bishop, i, 4, 12, 16, 34, 150, 156, 309, 317, 451.
Egan, Rev. John, i, 162.
Elder, Rev. A. J., ii, 225.
Emancipation, Catholic (1829), i, 100, 106, 110, 115, 267; ii, 65, 120, 378.
Emery, Father, ii, 178.
Emigration to New England, i, 20.
Emigrants, Catholic, ii, 373.
Emmett, Thomas Addis, i, 453; ii, 6.
Emmitsburg, i, 5; Daughters of Char-

ity of, ii, 135; Mount St. Mary's College at, ii, 232.
Engelhardt, Rev. Z., O.F.M., i, 556.
England family, i, 40.
England, Alexander, i, 225, 231, 372.
England, Edward, ii, 323.
England, Joanna Monica, i, 96, 299, 470, 484; ii, 137.
England, Bishop John: on loss and gain problem, i, 7; appointment to Charleston, 11; reconstruction of Church in Carolinas, 17; statesmanship, 35; early years, 36-58; memorial to, 37; Seminary days, 59-75; priesthood, 76-97; chaplain of Cork prison, 79; and Veto controversy, 98-123; first Bishop of Charleston, 283-298; and the *Cork Mercantile Chronicle*, 111; at Bandon, 120-121; and the Quarantotti Rescript, 114; and Rev. Richard Hayes, O.F.M., 118; and the Jesuits, 120; his *Memoirs of the American Church*, 124; and test clause of North Carolina Constitution, 132; sails for America, 298; his organization of the Diocese of Charleston, 299-342; his Constitution for diocesan government, 343-379; and the Hogan Schism, 380-425; and the dissensions in New York, 426-452; and the *United States Catholic Miscellany*, 453-473; founding of the Charleston Seminary, 474-516; method of diocesan development, 517-550; and the Church in Florida, 551-596; public discourses, ii, 1-47; address before Congress (1826), 48-67; attitude on provincial councils 68-110; at First Provincial Council (1829), 111-132; Assistant to Papal Throne, 140; educational and social works of, 133-172; helped by foreign missionary societies, 173-213; at Second Provincial Council (1833), 243-269; his Apostolic Delegation to Haiti, 270-313; and Bishop Clancy, 314-351; his letter to Lyons, 352-376; at Third Provincial Council (1837), 377-404; his writings, 405-479; and the general Conventions of the diocese, 480-501; at Fourth Provincial Council (1840), 502-529; last illness and death (April 11, 1842), 530-554; funeral, 541; eulogies on, 545-548.
England, Mary (Sister Catherine), i, 77; ii, 32, 138, 143.
England, Rev. Thomas, i, 39; ii, 542, 556.
Episcopal nominations, i, 34.
Epithets, Catholic, ii, 377.
Epochs of Irish History, ii, 8.
"Era of Good Feeling," i, 30.
Erasmus Smith Schools, i, 48.
Erection of new Sees (1808), i, 21.
Eulogies, on Bp. England, ii, 545-548.
Explanation of the Ceremonies of Holy Week, ii, 141.
Explanation of the Mass, i, 330-333; ii, 140.

Fabrique de l'Eglise, i, 9.
Faculties, extra-diocesan, ii, 263.
Far West, Church in, ii, 504.
Fasting, discipline on, ii, 254.
"Father of Provincial Councils," ii, 214.
Fayetteville, i, 129, 154.
Federalists, and Catholic, ii. 232.
Fenwick, Bishop Benjamin, of Boston, i, 34, 300-336 *passim*, 433, 450, 469, 573, 578; ii, 48, 137, 232, 479, 517.
Fenwick, Bishop Edward Dominic, O.P., of Cincinnati, i, 450, 518; ii, 115, 121.
Fenwick, Rev. Enoch, S.J., i, 574.
Fernandez, Dr., i, 261, 273.
Fesch, Cardinal, i, 573; ii, 276.
Ffrench, Rev. J., i, 12, 427, 436.
"Fifth Resolution" (1810), i, 108.
Finotti (*Bibliographia Catholica Americana*), i, 223; ii, 556.
Fire, Charleston (1838), ii, 483.
First General Convention of the Diocese (1839), ii, 480.
First Provincial Council (1829), i, 35, 475, 504; ii, 111-132, 214.
Fitzgerald, Rev. Andrew, ii, 332.
Fitzgibbon, Gerald, i, 45.
Fitzpatrick (*Life of Bishop Doyle*), i, 122.
Flaget, Bishop, i, 4, 6, 11, 13, 32, 428, 573; ii, 69, 107, 115, 235.
Florida, Church in, i, 551-597.
Florida martyrs, i, 553.
Foik, Dr. Paul, C.S.C., i, 453, 455, 460, 472.
Fontana, Cardinal, i, 29, 277, 283, 331, 344, 388; ii, 72, 78, 80, 87.
"Foreign Conspiracy," ii, 149, 205.
Foreign Missionary Societies, ii, 173-213.
Foreign Missions, Society of, ii, 175.
Forsyth, Hon. John, ii, 406.

Fourth Provincial Council (1840), ii, 502-529.
Francis I, Emperor, ii, 185.
Franciscan archives (Dublin), i, 204; ii, 560.
Franciscan College, Cork, i, 118.
Franciscan College, Rome, i, 118.
Franciscan Province of Santa Eleana, i, 554.
Franklin College (Athens, Ga.), ii, 37.
Fransoni, Cardinal, ii, 326, 330, 341, 531.
Freemasons, ii, 514.
French ascendency, ii, 79-80.
French Catholics, ii, 129.
French clergy, i, 31, 482.
French ecclesiastical junta, i, 275.
French pastors and Irish parishes, i, 31-33.
French Revolution, i, 32, 60; ii, 271.
Friars in Spanish America, i, 556.
Friends of Irish Freedom, ii, 120, 194.
Frontier movement, ii, 216.
Fuller, Rev. Richard, ii, 407, 421, 471.
Fundamental Constitutions (S. C.), i, 134, 177.
Further Documents etc., i, 228.

Gallagher, Rev. Simon Felix, D.D., i, 7, 34, 164-261 *passim*, 329, 336, 542.
Gallicanism, i, 29, 67, 100, 275, 278; ii, 72.
Gallitzin, Father Demetrius, i, 282; ii, 97, 400.
Gamble (*Savannah Duels*), ii, 17.
Gardoqui, Señor Diego de, i, 137-140.
Gartland, Bishop, i, 597.
Gasquet, Cardinal, ii, 258.
Gaston, Dr. Alexander, i, 131.
Gaston, Judge William, i, 124, 129, 132, 320, 324, 510; ii, 52, 127, 153, 463.
Gaston, Mrs., i, 124.
General Conventions of the Diocese of Charleston, ii, 480-501.
General Council of the Protestant Churches, ii, 377.
General Description of the Province of Baltimore, ii, 73.
"Genoese Letter," i, 115-117, 264, 269.
Georgetown (British Guiana), ii, 349.
Georgetown College, i, 5, 20, 208, 311, 312, 463, 574; ii, 317.
Georgetown, S. C., i, 154.
Georgia, Church in, i, 5, 12, 20, 387, 492, 523; ii, 37, 135.
Georgian, the, ii, 563.
Gerard, Sir Thomas, i, 125.
Gerdil, Cardinal, i, 102.
German Catholics (Phila.), ii, 383.
Ghent, Treaty of, i, 5; ii, 69.
Gildea, Rev. John, ii, 394, 514, 535.
Gillespy, Edward, i, 454.
Glennon, Archbishop, ii, 354.
Globe, the, i, 437; ii, 7.
Glodt, Rev. J. T., i, 553.
Glory, Pierre, ii, 273.
Gnesen-Posen, ii, 519.
Gomez, Father, i, 551, 573.
Gradwell, Dr., i, 333, 387-389; ii, 80, 112, 255.
Grand Model (Locke), i, 127.
Grassi, Rev. John, S.J., i, 6, 212.
Gregory XVI, i, 364, 517, 538; ii, 243, 274, 294, 314, 373, 471, 531.
Guale, i, 552, 554.
Gunpowder Plot, i, 127.

Healy, Archbishop, i, 49.
Heath, Sir Robert, i, 127, 134.
Hedge schools, i, 45.
Henry, Hugh T. (*Index to Pamphlets etc.*), i, 401.
Herbermann (*Sulpicians in the U. S.*), i, 476.
Héry du Jarday, Mère, ii, 141, 150, 170.
Hewit, Rev. A. F., i, 471; ii, 1, 409.
Haiti, Church in, i, 534-538; ii, 271. 313.
Harold, Father William Vincent, O.P., i, 6, 27, 32, 36, 399, 402-406, 425, 437; ii, 90, 233.
Harrison, President, ii, 41.
Hartford, Diocese of, ii, 551.
Harvard College, i, 311, 498.
Has the Immigrant Kept the Faith? (Shaughnessy), ii, 352.
Havana, Bishop of, i, 554, 555, 572.
Hawley, Rev. Wm., ii, 427.
Hayes, Father Richard, O.S.F., i, 90, 118, 119, 262, 542.
Hibernian Chronicle, i, 457.
Hibernian Society, ii, 7.
Hickey, Rev. E. J., ii, 173, 181, 561.
Hidden Phase of American History (O'Brien), ii, 2.
Hierarchy, meeting of (1810) ii, 68.
Highlanders, i, 128.
Historical Records and Studies (U. S. Cath. Hist. Society), ii, 519.
History of the Cath. Church in New York (Smith), ii, 379.

History of the Catholic Church in the U. S. (Murray), ii, 352.
History of the R. C. Church in the U. S. (O'Gorman), ii, 356.
Hogan, Rev. Wm., i, 381-394 *passim;* and Bishop England, i, 380-425; ii, 75, 87, 89.
Hoganites, i, 390-399 *passim.*
Hohenloe, Prince, i, 282.
Holy days of obligation, ii, 269.
Holy See, and Church in America, i, 99, 105, 116, 118, 427, 428, 518.
Holy Trinity Church (Phila.), i, 392, 394.
Hopkins (*Historical Sketch of St. Mary's Church, Charleston*), i, 141, 149.
Hoskyne, Rev. John, ii, 260.
House of Clergy, i, 493; ii, 467.
House of Lay Delegates, i, 493; ii, 497.
Hughes, Archbishop, i, 291, 354, 427, 472, 589; ii, 253, 260, 397, 509, 535.
Hughes-Breckinridge Controversy, ii, 51.
Hughes, Rev. Thomas, S.J., i, 126.
Huguenots, i, 134, 158.
Hurley, Rev. Michael, O.S.A., i, 394; ii, 236, 524.
Hus, John, ii, 50.
Husenbeth, i, 106.
Hynes, Bishop John, O.P., ii, 437.

Illinois Cath. Hist. Review, ii, 559.
Immigration, Irish, to the Carolinas, ii, 4.
Immigration, to the South, ii, 500.
Imminent Dangers (Morse), ii, 195.
Impediments, to Church progress, ii, 83, 267-268.
"Independent Catholick Church of America," i, 262-282, 428.
Indian missions, ii, 250.
Indiana, i, 4, 25, 30.
Indians, care of, ii, 263.
Indians, Religion and Customs of, ii, 16.
Infallibility, doctrine of, ii, 431.
Inginac, General, ii, 280.
Inglesi, Abbé, i, 14, 16; ii, 177.
Innocent XI, i, 128.
Institution, New York Literary, i, 310.
Institutions, religious, in U. S. (1833), ii, 250.
Interdict (St. Mary's, Charleston) i, 205.
Ireland, i, 20, 21, 105, 109, 116, 389, 428, 520, 535; history of, ii, 8; and America, ii, 1-6.
Ireland, Archbishop, ii, 354.
Irish Advocate, ii, 7.
Irish, and Democratic party, ii, 380.
Irish College Portfolio, ii, 316.
Irish College, Rome, i, 523.
Irish Freedom, Friends of, ii, 194.
Irish hierarchy, i, 14, 15, 22, 103-116 *passim.*
Irish, in America, i, 117, 119, 427, 433, 435.
Irish schoolmasters, ii, 4.
Irish Shield, ii, 7.
Irish Test Oath, i, 100.
Irishman and Charleston Weekly Register, ii, 7.

"J. K. L." (Bishop Doyle of Kildare-Leighlin), i, 55.
Jackson, Pres. Andrew, i, 5; ii, 120, 220.
Jamestown, i, 126, 552.
Jansenism, i, 67, 118.
Jansenist Church (Utrecht), i, 234, 322.
Jaricot, Abbé, ii, 177.
Jaricot, Pauline Marie, ii, 176.
Jeanjean, Rev. A., ii, 123, 140, 247, 275.
Jekyl Island, i, 156, 157, 309.
Jesuit, the, ii, 422.
Jesuits, i, 248; ii, 123, 197, 511.
Jus Patronatus, i, 233, 274, 415; ii, 126.

Kavanagh, Edward, ii, 454.
Keating, Rev. Dr., i, 136, 137, 141, 142.
Keeffe, Bishop Luke, i, 71.
Kelly, Bishop (Richmond), i, 300, 322, 327, 339, 380, 428, 451, 474; ii, 68.
Kemp, Bishop James, ii, 60.
Kenrick, Bishop Francis Patrick, of Philadelphia, i, 382, 518, 532; ii, 132, 134, 166, 218, 267, 541.
Kentucky, i, 4, 5, 20.
Kerney, Father Nicholas, i, 133, 279, 320.
King Louis I (Bavaria), ii, 183.
King, Rufus, i, 454; ii, 6.
Kirlin (*Catholicity in Philadelphia*), i, 42.
Kirwin, Rev. W. B., ii, 73.
Kohlmann, Rev. A., S.J, i, 312-313; ii, 131, 140, 294, 342
Kuhr, Father, ii, 342.

Lacy, Rev. Michael de, i, 133.

Laity's Directory, i, 515, ii, 73.
Lambruschini, Cardinal, ii, 318.
Lamott, Rev. J., ii, 183.
Lancaster Fund, ii, 193.
Lancaster Plan, i, 58.
Lazarists, ii, 175.
Leakage, statistics, ii, 375.
Lecky, i, 44.
Legare, Hugh, ii, 37.
Le Mercier, Father, i, 149, 159, 160.
Lenten Pastoral, i, 313.
Leo XII, ii, 114, 233.
Leopoldine Association of Vienna, i, 518, 522; ii, 187, 192, 197, 247, 326, 389, 485, 494.
Letter to the Society of Lyons, ii, 352-376.
Letters from Rome, ii, 294.
Letters on Domestic Slavery, ii, 406.
Letters on Various Misrepresentations of the Catholic Religion, ii, 427.
Letters to the Roman Catholics of the U. S., ii, 419, 436.
Lettres Edifiantes et Curieuses, ii, 17.
Liberia, Church in, ii, 175, 254, 263, 275, 536.
Liberty, Sons of, ii, 5.
Life and Times of John Carroll (Guilday), ii, 555.
Litta, Cardinal, i, 13, 115-117, 209, 211, 212, 225, 233, 263, 276.
Little Rock, Diocese of, ii, 551.
Locust Grove, i, 158, 160.
Loras, Bishop, ii, 264, 399.
Lordan, Honora, i, 40.
Losses, alleged Catholic, ii, 135, 352-376.
Louisiana, Church in, i, 4, 5, 7, 11, 573; ii, 179.
Louisville, Diocese of, ii, 511.
Louvain, University of, i, 60.
Lucerne Memorial, ii, 353.
Ludwigmissionsverein ii, 183.
Lynch, Bishop, i, 339, 536; ii, 1, 142, 172, 537, 552.
Lyons, Rev. Denis, i, 83.
Lyons, Society of the P. F. of, i, 505, 523, 531, ii, 485, 494.

Maes, Bishop, i, 367.
MacNeven, Dr. Wm., i, 454; ii, 6.
McCaffrey, Dr. John, i, 589.
McCarthy, Bishop Florence, (Cork), i, 103.
McCarthy, Father Felix, i, 160.
McCarthy, Justin, i, 56.
McCarthy, Mother Borgia, ii, 171.
McCarthy, Rev. Timothy, i, 372, 467, 585.
McDonnald, Dr. James C. W., i, 372.
McElrone, Hugh, ii, 412.
McElroy, Rev. John, S.J., ii, 510.
McEncroe, Father John, i, 336, 372, 467, 492, 502, 575; ii, 362.
McGee, Thomas D'Arcy, i, 472; ii, 2.
McInerny, Rev. M., H., O.P., ii, 560.
McMaster, John Bach, ii, 151.
McSherry, Rev Wm., S.J., ii, 260.
McSweeney, Rev. Patrick, ii, 314.
Mai, Cardinal, ii, 254.
Maréchal, Ambrose, third Archbishop of Baltimore: report to Propaganda, i, 6; and Irish clergy in America, 10; and Propaganda, 29; and appointments to American Sees, 31; and Diocese of Richmond, 32; and Charleston schismatics, 124-282; succeeds Archbishop Neale, 208; and Dr. Gallagher, 212; and Father Browne, O.S.A., 215; character of, 221; and Father Richard Hayes, O.F.M., 262; *Pastoral* to Catholics of Norfolk, 269; and Father Carbry, O.P., 279; and the erection of the Diocese of Charleston, 283; meeting with Bp. England, 308; and Bishop Kelly of Richmond, 322; journey to Rome, 327; and England's publication of the *Missal*, 330; attitude on Provincial Council, 342, 345; and England's "Constitution," 349; and trusteeism, 355; and Hogan, 356; and Dr. Conwell, 363; and the *abusus appellationis*, 370; and Bishop Poynter, 387; death of, 425, ii, 111; and Church in New York, i, 427; and Bishop Dubois, 445; and the *U. S. Cath. Miscellany*, 468; and Church in Florida, 572; and the Society of Lyons, ii, 181; and Provincial Council, opposition to, 68-110; and care for Indians and Negroes, 275.
Marguilliers, i, 9.
Marie de l'Incarnation, Mère, ii, 35.
Martinez, Father Peter, S.J., i, 553.
Maryland, i, 25; Catholics in, ii, 123, 365.
Mathew, Rev. Theobald, i, 36, 429; ii, 512.
Matthews, Rev. William, ii, 121, 233, 260, 383.
Mattingly Cure, i, 416.
May, Rev. J. J., ii, 563.

Mayne, Rev. Edward, i, 588-595.
Maynooth, i, 23, 24 101, 103, 114; ii, 257; College, i, 521; grant, i, 74.
Meehan, T. F., i, 453.
Meeting of hierarchy (1810), ii, 68.
Meine Reise (Salzbacher), ii, 213.
Memoir of Bishop England (Read), i, 40, 57.
Memorial tablet to John England, i, 37.
Memorial Volume of St. Mary's Seminary (Balt.), i, 476.
Memoirs of the American Church (England), i, 124.
Merchants' Quay (Franciscan archives), i, 264.
Messmer, Archbishop, ii, 354.
Messmer edition of England's *Works*, ii, 413.
Methodists, i, 21, 117, 158, 431, 574.
Metropolitan, the, ii, 218, 452.
Metropolitan Cath. Almanac, the, i, 542.
Metternich, i, 351; ii, 186, 247.
Mezzofanti, Cardinal, ii, 294.
Michigan Essay and Impartial Observer, i, 453.
Mier, Servandus, i, 390.
Miles, Bishop, ii, 248, 399.
Milner, Bishop, i, 78, 101, 106, 108, 109, 115-117.
Milwaukee, Diocese of, ii, 551.
Miscellany, U. S. Catholic, i, 112, 119, 334, 337, 342, 495, 539, 575; ii, 7, 501.
Missal, Roman, ii, 79.
Missionary Societies, foreign, ii, 173-213.
Mississippi, i, 25, 30, 125, 572.
Mitchell, Rev. J. D., i, 154.
Mobile, Diocese of, i, 578, 584.
Mohilow, Archbishop of, i, 33.
Moloney, Mother Mary Charles, ii, 143, 156, 166.
Monk, Maria, ii, 35, 379.
Monroe, President, i, 328; ii, 49.
Montgomery, Rev., C. P., O.P., ii, 510.
Moore, Governor, i, 554.
Morse, Samuel B., ii, 195.
Mount St. Mary's College (Emmitsburg), i, 476.
Moylan, Bishop (Cork), i, 53, 65, 69, 458; ii, 32.
Moylan, Gen. Stephen, i, 71.
Munich, St. Louis Society of, ii, 148, 183.
Murphy, Bishop John, i, 116, 291; ii, 140.
Murray, John O'Kane, ii, 352.

Nagle, Nano, i, 51, 72.
Nation, the, ii, 529.
National Councils, Maréchal's opposition to, ii, 68.
National Intelligencer, i, 341.
National Library, Dublin, i, 111.
National Pastorals (Guilday), ii, 559.
National Republicans, ii, 404.
Native Americanism, ii, 378, 396, 525.
Native and foreign elements, in American Church, ii, 507.
Nature of Religious Orders, ii, 28.
Neale, Archbishop, i, 11, 29, 39; ii, 69, 74.
Negro schools, ii, 151.
Newbern, i, 124, 131.
New England, i, 3, 4, 20, 30.
Newman, Cardinal, ii, 529, 552.
New Orleans Church in, i, 4, 5, 21, 575; ii, 241, 264.
Newspapers, Catholic, ii, 208, 218.
New York: erection of See of, i, 4; Catholics in, 7; Father Carbry in, 12; administration of Bishop Connolly, 15; disturbance in Church of, 16; Catholics in (1819), 18; losses in Church of, 21; Bishop Concanen's appointment to, 32; Bishop Connolly's consecration, 33; schismatic group in, 35; Bishop England in, 380; Maréchal in, 392; dissensions in, 426-452; financial condition of, 538; burning of St. Mary's Church, ii, 220; administration of Bishop Dubois, 232; Bishop England on condition of Church in, 345.
Noble, Gov. Patrick, ii, 37.
Nolan, Bishop Edward, ii, 325, 332.
Nominations to vacant Sees, i, 34; ii, 263.
Non sine magno (1822), i, 399.
Norfolk, Church in, i, 10, 12, 15, 20, 35, 209, 212, 269, 380, 426, 428.
North American Review, ii, 430.
North Carolina, i, 25, 387.
North Presentation Convent (*Annals*). i, 76; ii, 143.
Northwest Territory, i, 4, 25.
Notice sur l'Etat actuel etc., ii, 179.
Notizie Varie (Grassi), i, 6.
Nouvelles Lettres etc., ii, 176.
Nullification, ii, 423.

Oath of Allegiance, i, 43, 99, 100.
O'Brien, Rev. Eris, ii, 293.

O'Brien, M. J. (*Hidden Phase etc.*), ii, 2.
O'Connor, Bishop Michael, ii, 322, 324, 327.
O'Connell, Daniel, i, 107-123 *passim*, 459; ii, 201, 471, 529.
O'Connell, Rev. J. J., O.S.B., ii, 550.
O'Daniel, Rev. Victor, O.P., i, 6; ii, 182, 557.
Odin, Archbishop, ii, 260, 530.
O'Driscoll, Dr., i, 222, 225, 259, 261.
O'Flynn, Rev. Jeremiah, i, 400; ii, 293.
Oglethorpe, i, 157, 552.
O'Gorman (*Hist. of the R. C. Church in the U. S.*), ii, 356.
O'Gorman, Rev Michael, i, 12, 434.
O'Hannan, Rev. Anthony, i, 328, 329, 336, 391, 396.
On Classical Education, ii, 21.
On the Pleasures of the Scholar, ii, 37.
Orange, lodges, i, 100, 112; ii, 378, 379.
Oregon, Diocese of, ii, 55.
Organization of Diocese of Charleston, ii, 17.
Origine et Progrès etc., ii, 185.
O'Leary, Rev. Arthur, O.F.M., i, 55.
O'Meally, Father Thaddeus, i, 411-419 *passim*, 466-469.
Orphans, ii, 145, 373.
O'Sullivan, Capt. Florence, i, 134.
Outrages, against Catholics, ii, 378, 421.
Oxford Movement, ii, 529.

Pactum (Bishop Conwell), ii, 97.
"Papists," i, 134, 135, 157, 158; ii, 379, 458.
Paris, University of, i, 60.
Parochial schools, ii, 128, 518.
Parsons, Rev. J. Wilfrid, S.J., i, 6.
Pastoral, Lenten (England), i, 317.
Pastoral Letter, of 1829, ii, 123, 128; of 1833, ii, 229, 269; of 1837, ii, 392; of 1840, ii, 498, 516.
Pastoral Letter (Clancy), ii, 340.
Pastoral Letter (Dubois), i, 446; ii, 232.
Pastoral Letter (England), i, 301-307; ii, 418.
Pastoral Letter (Maréchal), i, 269, 287.
Pastoral Letter, of the Protestant Episcopal Churches of the U. S. (1829), ii, 451.
Pastors, canonical status of, ii, 132.
Paul III, ii, 270.
Paulists, ii, 1.
Pedicini, Cardinal, i, 278; ii, 254, 257, 265, 277.
Penal Code, i, 44, 62; ii, 190.
Pensacola, i, 573, 584, 590.
Perrone, Cardinal, ii, 294.
Persons, Rev. Robert, S.J., i, 126.
Petigru, James L., ii, 37.
Petit de Meurville, ii, 177
Petit de Villiers, i, 505, 509, 542.
Petit, Madame, ii, 177.
Petition of the Catholics of St. Augustine, i, 551.
Petition, of Charleston trustees, i, 240.
Phelon, Colonel, i, 340, 341.
Philadelphia: Constitutional Convention at, i, 1; Suffragan See of (1808), 4; statistics of Church in (1818), 7; schismatic movement in, 12; Bishop Conwell's administration of, 15; Father W. V. Harold in, 22; number of priests in (1821), 25; trusteeism in, 28; vacant See of, 32; Hogan Schism, 380-425; Bishop England in, 381, 428; Bishop Kenrick's coadjutorship of, 518; Bishop Conwell's administration, ii, 68; Conwell's *Pactum*, 92, 97.
"Philo-Canon," ii, 259.
Pittsburgh, Diocese of, i, 3, 137; ii, 551.
Pius VII, i, 98, 114, 117, 212, 227, 262, 276, 305, 386, 399, 426, 523; ii, 70.
Pius VIII, ii, 123.
Pius X, ii, 354.
Plessis, Bishop (Quebec), i, 6, 10, 11, 16, 280, 428.
Pletz, Canon Joseph, ii, 186.
Plowden, Sir Edmund, i, 127.
Plumeau, John F., i, 225, 341.
Pontifex Romanus (1511), ii, 270.
Poor Clares, ii, 386.
"Popery," i, 135; ii, 195, 202, 207, 215, 217, 451, 454, 466.
Popes, deposing power of, ii, 60.
Port au Prince, ii, 277.
Portfolio, Irish College, i, 523; ii, 337, 559.
Portier, Bishop (Mobile), i, 578-590 *passim*; ii, 118, 321.
Power, Rev. John, D.D., i, 107, 428, 429, 430, 437, 445, 452; ii, 123, 156, 260, 266, 317, 345, 400.
Poynter, Bishop (London), i, 433.
Practical and Internal Evidence against Catholicism (Blanco White), ii, 66, 436.

Presbyterians, i, 86, 121, 431, 574, 576; ii, 14.
Presentation Nuns, i, 52, 55, 72; ii, 138.
Present State etc. (Smyth), i, 165.
Presidential election (1840), ii, 41.
Prohibition, ii, 472.
Propaganda, Sacred Congregation of, i, 125, 147, 148, 388, 390, 518, 531, 578; Archives of i, 6, 150; ii, 559.
Propagation of Faith, Society of, i, 518.
Protestant, the, ii, 227, 379, 452.
Prost, Rev. Joseph, C.S.S.R., ii, 510.
Protestant Catechism, ii, 443
Protestant hostility, i, 16, 527; ii, 421, 463.
Protestants, i, 117, 524, 526, 529.
Public discourses, of Bp. England, ii, 1-57.
Public schools, Catholic children in, ii, 518.
Purcell, Archbishop, i, 489; ii, 248, 349.
Purrysbourg, i, 158.

Quakers, i, 117.
Quarantotti, J. B., i, 114-119.
Quebec, Archiepiscopal Archives of, ii, 82, 561.

Rale (Rasle), Father, ii, 231.
Raleigh, N. C., i, 125-126.
Ratio Status etc. (Maréchal), i, 251, 562.
Read, W. G. (*Memoir of Bishop England*), i, 40, 65, 111, 112; ii, 123, 407.
Records (ACHS), ii, 559.
"Redemptioners," ii, 4.
Redemptorists, ii, 251.
Reed, Rebecca, ii, 32.
Register, St. Mary's, Charleston, S. C., i, 143; of Savannah, i, 159, 160.
Regium placitum, i, 99.
Relaxation, of penal laws, i, 47.
Religious allegiance, ii, 392.
Religious Cabinet, ii, 563.
Religious disabilities in the States, ii, 419.
Religious equality, i, 352.
Religious freedom, ii, 366.
Religious intolerance, ii, 419.
Religion of American Indians (Bp. England), ii, 16.
Religious Repository, 83, 457.
Religious statistics (1833), ii, 215.
Republic in Danger (Bp. England), ii, 220, 458.
Republican ideals and Catholicism, ii, 426.
Rese, Bishop, Frederic (Detroit): early years, ii, 181-182; consecration of, 228; and Diocese of Cincinnati, 246; at Second Provincial Council, 260; resignation, 386-389; death, 389.
Resolutions, Maynooth (1799), i, 98.
Reynolds, Bishop I. A.: appointment to Charleston, i, 379; on Dr. England's writings, 460, 471; consecration of, 544; publication of Dr. England's *Works*, ii, 1, 172, 409, 413; and Diocesan Conventions, 496; election to Charleston, 551; policy, 552.
Reynoso, Fray Alonzo, i, 554.
Rhode Island, i, 24.
Rice, Father John, O.S.A., i, 279.
Richard, Father Gabriel, i, 453; ii, 51.
Richmond, Diocese of, i, 6, 7, 13, 20, 29, 32, 390; ii, 400, 512.
Rico, "Bishop," i, 390.
Right of patronage, i, 258.
Ringel, Don Emmanuel, i, 160.
Roanoke Island, i, 125-126.
Roloff, Rev. Francis, i, 392-397; ii, 383.
Roman Missal, i, 428; ii, 79.
Romanos Pontifices (1881) ii, 125.
Rome, and the Church in the United States: i, 21, 23, 29, 31, 110, 114-119, 123, 126, 147, 305, 333, 427, 518, 522, 538; ii, 111-132, 243-269, 377-404, 502-529.
Rome, Archives of, ii, 559-560.
Rome, English College of, i, 126.
Rome, University of, i, 60.
Rosati, Bishop (St. Louis): on Charleston Constitution, i, 377; attitude towards Dr. England, 532, 551-596 *passim*; at First Provincial Council, ii, 118; at Second Provincial Council, 246, 260; friendship for Dr. England, 396.
Ross, Rev. J. Elliott, C.S.P., i, 8.
Ross, Mary, i, 156, 553
Rost, Father Frederic, i, 590-592.
Roth, Rev. Benedict, O.S.B., i, 559.
Ryan, Rev. Edwin J., i, 556.
Ryan, Father John, O.P., i, 107, 109, 137, 148, 402, 423, 435; ii, 107, 109, 233.
Ryan, Lawrence, i, 231.
Ryan, Rev. Matthew, i, 136.

Sacred Congregation de Propaganda Fide, i, 9, 13, 14, 16, 34; ii, 173.
Sacred Heart, Sisters of the, ii, 124.
St. Augustine, Florida, Church in, i, 551, 554, 573, 589; ii, 142.
St. Augustine's Church (Philadelphia), i, 589.
St. Augustine *Herald*, i, 587.
St. Isidore College (Rome), i, 264.
St. John Church, Frederick, Md., ii, 397.
St. Louis Archdiocesan Archives, i, 522.
St. Louis Catholic Historical Review, ii, 559.
St. Louis Mission Society (Munich), i, 518.
St. Mary's Church, Charleston, i, 141; ii, 159.
St. Mary's Church, Philadelphia, i, 28.
St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore, i, 154; ii, 120, 266, 396.
St. Mary's Seminary (Cork), ii, 314, 324.
St. Mary's Seminary, Halifax), ii, 533.
St. Mary's University (Baltimore), i, 5.
St. Patrick's College (Carlow), i, 60.
St. Patrick's College (Maynooth), i, 64.
St. Peter's Church (New York City), ii, 156.
St. Simon, island of, i, 156.
St. Thomas, island of, ii, 278.
Salgado, Father, ii, 276.
Salzbacher, Canon Joseph, ii, 213.
San Domingo, Church in, i, 158-159, 522; ii, 177, 270.
San Marino, Brotherhood of, ii, 160.
San Pedro (Cumberland Island), i, 554.
Santa Caterina, i, 156-157.
Sapelo, i, 156, 157.
Savannah, Diocese of, i, 35; ii, 551.
Schabert, Rev. J. A., ii, 183.
Schism, Charleston, i, 164-261, 431.
Schism, New York, ii, 79.
Schism, Norfolk, i, 212, 247.
Schism, Philadelphia, ii, 68.
Schlesinger, ii, 151, 216.
School, for free negroes, ii, 151.
Schoolmasters, Irish, ii, 4.
School, parochial, i, 84; ii, 128.
Second General Convention of the Diocese (1840), ii, 489.
Second Provincial Council of Baltimore (1833), i, 33, 532; ii, 141, 192, 214, 242, 243-269.
Sees: appointments to American, ii, 245; Chicago, ii, 551; Detroit, ii, 228, 250; Irish, i, 102; Little Rock, ii, 551; Milwaukee, ii, 551; New York, i, 437; Pittsburgh, ii, 551; Santiago de Cuba, i, 552, 555; Savannah, i, 597; Wilmington, ii, 400; method of filling vacant, ii, 264; vacant, ii, 83.
Segura, Father, i, 553.
Seton, Mother, i, 5.
Seven Hills Magazine, i, 345; ii, 561.
"Shame of Massachusetts," ii, 378, 516.
Shamrock, the, i, 454; ii, 7.
Shea, John Gilmary, i, 3, 272, 342, 426; ii, 82, 421, 556.
Shea Collection (Georgetown University), i, 551; ii, 562.
Sibourd, Father Louis, i, 153.
Sisters of Charity, ii, 124, 225.
Sisters of Charity of Nazareth, i, 5.
Sisters of Loretto, i, 5; ii, 124, 251.
Sisters of Mercy, ii, 134, 144, 150, 320, 329, 487.
Sisters of Providence, ii, 250.
Six Months in a Convent (Reed), ii, 32, 147.
Sketch of Irish History, i, 85.
Slave Code, ii, 153.
Smith, Rev. John Talbot, i, 445; ii, 379.
Society for the Propagation of the Faith, i, 590; ii, 123.
Society, Literary and Philosophical (Charleston), ii, 16.
Society of Jesus, i, 120, 354, 480; ii, 124.
Society of St. John the Baptist, ii, 486, 493.
Society of St. Sulpice, i, 481.
Somaglia, Cardinal della, i, 583.
Sources, essay on, ii, 555-563.
South Carolina, Church in, i, 20, 25, 123, 387, 433, 523, 557.
South Carolina Historical Society, ii, 563.
Souvay, Rev. Dr. Charles, C.M., i, 575; ii, 247.
"S. P. C. K.," ii, 176.
"S. P. G.," ii, 176.
Spanish colonies, Church in, ii, 363.
Springfield (Ill.), Diocese of, ii, 511.
"Stranger's Fever," ii, 160.
State, and Church, ii, 14-16, 427.
State Policy in Irish Education (Cor-

coran), i, 43, 45.
Stokes, Rev. Joseph, i, 543.
Sulpicians, i, 165, 518, 537, 574, 597; ii, 124, 252.
Synods, necessity of, ii, 248.

Tallaght, Dominican archives of, i, 6, 16; ii, 107, 237, 560.
Taney, Roger Brooke, i, 592, ii, 123, 220.
Taylor, Judge, i, 323, 325.
Taylor, Rev. William, i, 291, 394, 397, 435, 437, 445, 446; ii, 75, 137, 232.
Tejada, Bishop, i, 558.
Temperance societies, ii, 512.
Tennessee, i, 4, 25.
Tessier, Father John, S.S., i, 216, 330; ii, 69, 122.
Test Act (1672), i, 100.
Texas, independence of (1836), ii, 402.
Theobald, Rev. S. L., ii, 472.
Third General Convention of Diocese (1841), ii, 496, 534.
Third Provincial Council (1837), ii, 377-404.
Timon, Bishop John, C.M., ii, 402, 530.
Titus Oates Plot, i, 100.
Transubstantiation, i, 163.
Trent, Council of, i, 397; ii, 243, 248, 252, 259.
Tridentine seminaries, i, 479-480.
Troy, Archbishop (Dublin), i, 14, 32, 65, 96, 101-108, 136, 143, 159, 267, 276, 327, 343, 427; ii, 86, 560.
Trusteeism, i, 28; ii, 241.
Trusteemania, i, 164, 248, 251, 287, 334.
Trustees, i, 143, 146, 150, 160, 436; ii, 76.
Truth Teller, i, 435; ii, 7.
Twomy, Father John, i, 328-329, 336, 338, 398.
Tyler, President, ii, 41.

Union of Church and States, ii, 14-16.
United Irishmen, i, 73; ii, 6.
United States, Catholic Church in, i, 1, 3, 6, 117, 121, 426, 430, 434; ii, 133-172; 214-242; 405-479 *passim*.
United States Catholic Historical Society (*Hist. Records and Studies*), ii, 559.
United States Catholic Miscellany, i, 453-473; ii, 218, 423.
University of Georgia, ii, 37.
University of North Carolina, i, 129.
University of St. Mary (Baltimore), i, 476.
Urban College, i, 477; ii, 175.
Ursuline Manual of Prayers, the, ii, 156.
Ursulines, Boston, ii, 138.
Ursulines, Canada, ii, 35.
Ursulines, Charleston, i, 52, 72, 521, 527; ii, 143, 146, 170, 172.
Ursulines, Charlestown, Mass., ii, 27, 454.
Ursulines, New Orleans, ii, 35.
Ursulines, New York, ii, 35.
Utrecht, i, 119, 234, 272, 276.

Vacant Sees, ii, 83, 88, 94-97, 269.
Valera, Archbishop, ii, 276.
Van Buren, President, ii, 471, 523.
Varela, Rev. Felix, ii, 390.
Vaughan, Cardinal, ii, 125.
Vaux, Father Lawrence, i, 314.
Verot, Bishop (St. Augustine), i, 597; ii, 391.
Vestry (Charleston), i, 143, 151, 152.
Veto, i, 99, 102, 105, 107, 111, 123.
Veto controversy, i, 117-122; ii, 7.
Vetoism, i, 116-119, 262.
Vicariate of Alabama-Florida, i, 574.
Vienna, Congress of, i, 269.
Vienna, Leopoldine Association of, i, 117, 520-531; ii, 148.
Vincennes, Diocese of, i, 24, 532, 533, 578; ii, 191, 254, 261, 265.
Vincentians, ii, 175, 251.
Vindiciae Hibernicae (Carey), ii, 9.
Virginia, Church in, i, 5, 14, 20, 25, 32, 533, 552; ii, 262.
Visitandines, i, 5, 257; ii, 124, 250.
Vocations, i, 22.

Waddell, Dr. Moses, ii, 37.
Wallace, Rev. James, i, 252, 256, 299, 310, 313, 317, 337, 483; ii, 333.
Weld, Cardinal, i, 107; ii, 251, 254.
Welfare, social, in Charleston, ii, 133-172.
Wesley, John, i, 158.
West Indies, i, 158, 160; ii, 270.
Westward migration, i, 30.
Wheeler, Rev. Michael, ii, 111, 123.
Whigs, ii, 404.
White, Blanco, ii, 65, 406, 435.
White, Rev. Dr. Charles I., ii, 390, 510, 551.
Whitfield, James, fourth Archbishop of Baltimore: appointment as coadjutor to Maréchal, i, 34; calls First Provincial Council, 359; attitude towards Dr. England, 360, 504, 521-

522; opposition to Provincial Council, ii, 68-110 *passim;* consecration of, 113; and Second Provincial Council, 243-269; death, 385; official papers of, 562.
Willington, Academy of, ii, 37.
Wilmington, Del., See at, ii, 400.
Wilmington, N. C., i, 318.
Wisconsin, Church in, ii, 512.
Wiseman, Cardinal, ii, 255, 529.
Works, of Bishop England, ii, 1, 409, 415-417, 552.
Wriothesley, Henry, i, 126.
Writings on American History (Griffin), ii, 556.
Writings, of Bishop England, ii, 405-479.
Wycliffe, ii, 51.

Yamassee revolt, i, 135, 552, 554.
Yellow fever, ii, 138.
Young, Mrs. (Sister M. Ursula), i, 89.
Young, Rev. Nicholas, O.P., ii, 260.

Zwierlein, Rev. Dr. F., i, 11.

DATE DUE